

**Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Coastal Conservancy Grant Agreement No. 03-051**

FINAL REPORT



Christine Jordan
Assistant Program Manager
Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program

Trinity County Planning Department
Natural Resources Division
June 4, 2007

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Acknowledgements:

This project represents thousands of hours of effort and dedication by people throughout Northern California, many of whom cannot be individually recognized for their assistance and support. Janet Clements began this project for the Five Counties Program (5C) and in 2004 left to pursue other goals. Christine Jordan began managing the 5C Migration Barrier Removal program in 2005 and made a smooth transition into managing the many projects under this grant

The counties' engineering staffs undertook projects and provided valuable insight.

Thank you: Howard Dashiell and Alex Straessle - Mendocino County; Chris Whitworth - Humboldt County; Art Reeve, Juris Mergups and Bill Lewis - Del Norte County; and, Carl Bonomini, Andrew Pence, Randy Cessna, Steve Roberts and Steve Judson - Trinity County

Many organizations and individuals have quietly or publicly shown support of the projects, including: Tom Weseloh - Cal Trout, Zack Larson - Smith River Advisory Council; John Schwabe - Fish and Game; and others

The project would not have been successful without the advice, direction and help of Michael Bowen of the Coastal Conservancy staff. Most importantly, we thank the Five Counties Policy Board and the Trinity County staff that have supported the 5C Program since its inception

Respectfully,

Mark Lancaster, Director
Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




5C dedicates the completion of this project to the memory of Tim McKay

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Project Summary

This grant contributed to the design, permitting and cost estimates for improving 26 migration barriers on private, county, State and federal lands within Mendocino, Humboldt, Del Norte and Trinity counties. Of these 26 projects, eight were constructed between 2005 and 2007; four are to be completed in 2007; and, three are planned for construction in 2008. The remaining eleven projects are undergoing design revisions or not scheduled for a specific construction year at this time. The projects, at completion, will restore access to 49 miles of spawning and rearing habitat for salmonids, will prevent 42,932 cubic yards of sediment delivery from failed culvert crossings and will reduce transportation maintenance activities, and associated costs, during high storm flows. Funds from this grant contributed to leveraging an additional \$2.5 million in engineering, permitting and construction of the eight projects that were constructed between 2005 and 2007 (refer to graphs below). The remaining Conservancy funding has leveraged \$164,713 in engineering and permitting, funded by the Counties, State and Federal agencies.



Introduction

For decades, culverts on established county roads and state highways have disrupted the spawning and rearing behavior of all four species of anadromous salmonids in California: Chinook and coho salmon, coastal rainbow trout, and coastal cutthroat trout. The problem was recognized more than 70 years ago, when the Forest Service and the California Division of Highways (Caltrans) were constructing roads in the Klamath River watershed:

"In a number of instances both State and Forest Service crews have in the process of road construction cut off spawning tributaries.... They have done this especially by directing streams through culverts whose low ends terminate in vertical drops of fifteen to thirty feet, barring the way to spawning steelhead and salmon... It cannot be too strongly emphasized that when possible, small bridges rather than culverts, should be installed in spawning streams, even through the cost of construction be greater. It is certainly "robbing Peter to pay Paul" to put in low-cost, impassible culverts on the one hand and to expend money for stream improvement on the other."

-A.G. Taft & Leo Shapovalov (Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Fisheries) February, 1935

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

In the rush to reopen road systems in Northwestern California following the 1955 and 1964 floods, many stream crossings were reinstalled with little to no consideration for fluvial or biological processes. Culverts were installed high in the road prism and set at steep grades, resulting in 2-3 foot, if not more, jumps at their outlets. By the time salmonid populations were listed under the State or federal Endangered Species Act, many of these culvert crossings were impassable due to the outlet jumps, velocities within the culverts exceeding swim speeds of juveniles and adult salmonids, or other problems.

This grant contributed immensely to the ongoing restoration efforts in Northwestern California by addressing a combination of aged infrastructure and passage design criteria for migrating juvenile and adult salmonids.

Within Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Siskiyou and Trinity Counties there are 245 inventoried migration barriers on County roads. There are approximately 967 recorded barriers on public and private roads within this area (California Passage Assessment Database, 2007), 810 of which are road-crossings. The barriers, mostly culverts, are either undersized, set at too steep a grade, or retrofitted with failing or ineffective baffle structures. These conditions have prevented adult and juvenile fish passage due to excessive jump heights between culvert outlets and plunge pools below, impassably high-flow velocities within the culverts during migration flows and/or too shallow of flows in low flow conditions.

This grant was unique in that it provided for projects to be completely designed in advance of securing construction funding, allowing the Counties and other entities to responsibly apply for implementation funds. It has also resulted in "shelf ready" projects that can wait to be constructed based upon prioritization, and under more favorable market conditions (such as lower materials and fuel costs). Despite the available grant sources for implementation of barrier removal projects, sufficient funding to complete engineering and permitting has been limited. The original grant, awarded in 2003, aimed to complete the design and permitting of sixteen high-priority projects located on County roads and other Federal/State properties. An amendment to the grant agreement in 2005 allowed for the design of an additional nine projects, located on County, State and private roads. The completion of the design and permitting phases for these twenty-six projects (Table 1) has facilitated implementation, continuing the recovery of anadromous fish and other aquatic species habitats found in coastal and inland watersheds. Projects funded under this grant were limited to anadromous fish-bearing streams within Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, and Trinity counties. An additional benefit of these projects includes the replacement of degraded culverts that are nearing the end of their functionality. Doing so improves local infrastructure and reduces future maintenance costs, particularly those associated with storm events and emergency repair needs.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Project	Implementing Entities	Status
Griffin Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project	Del Norte County CDD	Design Completed Construction in 2008 or 2009
Yonkers Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project	Del Norte County CDD City of Crescent City	Design Completed Constructed in 2006
Graham Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project	Humboldt County DPW	Design Completed Constructed in 2005
Indian Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project	Humboldt County DPW	Design Completed Construction in 2007
Painter Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project	Humboldt County DPW	Design Partially Completed No Construction Date Planned
Rocky Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project	Humboldt County DPW	Design Completed Construction in 2007
Albion River & Marsh Creek Migration Barrier Removal Projects	Mendocino County DOT	Design Completed Constructed in 2006
Ancestor Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project	Mendocino County DOT	Design Completed Construction in 2009
Dark Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project	Mendocino County DOT	Design Partially Completed No Construction Date Planned
Ryan Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project	Mendocino County DOT	Design Completed Construction in 2007 or 2008
Conner Creek #1 & #2 Fish Passage Improvement Projects	Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program	Design Completed Construction Planned for 2008
Deadwood Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project	Trinity County DOT Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program	Design Completed Constructed in 2005
Little Browns Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project	Trinity County DOT	Design Completed Construction in 2007
Soldier Creek #1 & #2 Migration Barrier Removal Projects	Trinity County DOT	Design Completed Constructed in 2005
North & South Fork Caspar Creek Fish Passage Improvement Projects	California Department of Forestry United States Forest Service	Design Completed Construction in 2007 & 2008
North & South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement Projects South Fork Ryan Creek – Hamman Driveway Crossing	Caltrans – NF Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program – Others	NF – Design Completed No Construction Date Planned SF & Hamman Driveway– Designs Complete Construction in 2008 & 2009
North Fork Schooner Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project	Mendocino County RCD	Design Completed No Construction Date
Salmon Creek Tidegates Fish Passage & Habitat Improvement Project	Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife & Wetlands Restoration Association	Design Completed Constructed in 2007
Yontocket Slough Fish Passage & Habitat Enhancement Project	California State Parks California Department of Fish & Game	Partial Design Completed No Construction Date Planned
Fish Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project	Caltrans California State Parks	Partially Designed Project Dropped

Table 1 - Projects included in for design under Grant Agreement 03051 with the State Coastal Conservancy

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

The Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program (5C) administered this grant through Trinity County. The 5C is a large-scale watershed and salmonid conservation effort formed by the Boards of Supervisors of Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Siskiyou and Trinity counties in response to the 1997 listing of the coho salmon as a Threatened species under the Federal Endangered Species Act. Since the program's inception, 5C has been committed to the development and implementation of land use conservation standards and practices that reduce erosion, improve water quality and quantity, and restore anadromous salmonid habitat within the Southern Oregon-Northern California Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit for coho salmon (SONCC ESU). Defining the Program area boundaries, the SONCC ESU for coho is not the only ESU in which 5C activities have had a beneficial impact. 5C-related barrier and sediment reduction work also affects the the CCC (Central California Coast) coho ESU, the California Coastal chinook ESU, the Northern California steelhead ESU. The Migration Barrier Inventory and Removal Program comprises just one element of the 5C and to date, 48 projects have been completed under this program, restoring access to 119 miles of anadromous salmonid habitat. Refer to the Five Counties website (www.5counties.org) for more information on the program and its work products.

Benefits of the 5C's migration barrier removal program include not only improved access to historic salmonid habitat, but also reduced maintenance and emergency repair costs for County transportation departments. The Counties realize a substantial financial benefit in reduced maintenance costs with the new crossing structures, as well as an overall social benefit. The projected, maintenance-free lifespan of new structures that can pass fish, 100-year flows and associated bedload and debris is longer than that of traditional culvert repairs or replacements that tend to plug annually during high flows, cause flooding of nearby properties, or simply wash out. Another benefit of replacing undersized culverts with properly sized structures is the reduction of potential sediment delivery in the event of culvert failure. With the 48 projects that have been constructed under the 5C Program, approximately 67,305 cubic yards of sediment were removed from road crossings that had a high likelihood of failure, and had in past high flow years, failed. The initial design and implementation costs for full stream simulation and hydraulic design option crossings are high, but over time, are offset by the reduced annual repair and maintenance costs, and flood event replacement costs, of failed crossings.

One of the key benefits of this type of grant and having projects properly designed and permitted prior to implementation, is the ability to accurately predict what the cost of implementation will be for a given project. A construction estimate is included in each final design for the projects not yet completed which will be utilized to apply for implementation funds. Historically, the lack of funding for engineering and permitting resulted in the Counties, and other entities, applying for construction funding prior to completing all portions of design. In some instances, the actual costs of constructing a project far exceeded the amount applied for and received under construction grants. Cost overruns and changes in economics between the time that a grant is written and a project is constructed have been well documented for 5C projects. This grant agreement leveraged County engineering

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

department funds and state/federal dollars as well as facilitated cooperation among federal, state and local agencies for completing design and permitting of high priority fish passage projects.

Migration Barrier Inventories within the 5C Program Area

The projects selected by 5C staff for inclusion in this grant agreement were based on the following inventories and their project prioritizations. Other factors, including discussions with California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and Conservancy staff, as well as biological considerations of anadromous salmonids, were taken into account during project selection.

County Road Barrier Inventory

The 5C Migration Barrier Inventory was completed from 1998 through 2004 and resulted in the identification of 245 barriers on county maintained stream crossings within anadromous reaches. These inventories were conducted by Ross Taylor & Associates with funding from the CDFG. County-maintained stream crossings (typically culverts) within present and historic anadromous reaches were analyzed with FishXing software to determine fish passage capability. Culvert statistics were also recorded (diameter, length, slope, etc.) and the barrier status (complete, partial, temporal) was described for adults and juveniles. As barriers were identified, they were ranked in an order from high to low priority for treatment. Each barrier was assigned a score based on anadromous species diversity at the crossing (both historic and present); the extent of the barrier, or percent passable; habitat quality and quantity upstream of the barrier; and, the current condition of the crossing (i.e. the risk of culvert failure as related to sizing and flow capacity). On a site-specific basis, varying factors influenced the ranking; including fish observations at crossings, roadfill that may potentially deliver to a stream should the culvert fail, presence of other barriers upstream and/or downstream, perceived project cost, schedule of other road maintenance and repair projects, and local agency biologist recommendations. The County projects selected under this grant agreement were based on the 5C Program-wide prioritization ranking matrix.

Caltrans District 1 Barrier Inventory

In March of 2001, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) initiated the North Coast Pilot Research Study to identify State Highway System culverts that blocked or impeded upstream or downstream passage of anadromous salmonids. The geographic limits of the pilot study were the coastal counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, and Mendocino in Caltrans District 1. The study identified 411 potential stream crossings for fish passage improvement. As of December 1, 2004, 312 of those sites had been analyzed to identify the potential impediments to fish passage. Impediments to juvenile and adult passage during migration flows included high-water velocities and low-water depths through crossings and excessive outlet jumps. FishXing analysis of the 312 sites showed that 60% did not meet the current fish passage guidelines for existing culverts. The data from this analysis is located within the *Caltrans District 1 Pilot Fish Passage Assessment Study: Volume 1* (Margaret Lang et al, 2005) and was utilized in the selection of an

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

additional nine projects in 2005. Among the projects selected for design under this grant were the first and second highest ranked priority sites in District 1, Fish Creek and North Fork Ryan Creek. The barrier improvement for South Fork Ryan Creek, and a private crossing upstream, were also designed under this grant agreement due to the proximity of the project sites and the cost effectiveness of treating those sites at the same time.

Inventory Of Barriers To Fish Passage In California's Coastal Watersheds

This inventory report was completed by the California Coastal Conservancy in 2004. This report was also utilized to determine priority projects. Projects specifically identified in this inventory that were not located on county roads or State Highways included Caspar Creek and North Fork Schooner Gulch. These were considered high priority projects due to the habitat that they could provide for the Central California Coast (CCC) coho and the Northern California steelhead Evolutionary Significant Units. These ESUs are listed as endangered and threatened, respectively. The existing fish ladders on Caspar Creek, located in the Jackson Demonstration State Forest in Mendocino County, are barriers to all age classes of coho and steelhead. The proposed project will replace the deteriorating wooden ladders on both North and South Fork Caspar Creek with new structures that provide for improved passage. The Schooner Gulch project was described in this inventory as a high priority crossing for sediment reduction as well as fish passage improvement. It is also referenced in the 2001 *CDFG Stream Inventory Report*. The crossing, located on a private road between the Gualala and Garcia River watersheds in Mendocino County, is a complete barrier to adults and juveniles due to the length of the culvert, the flow velocities during migration flows, and the perched outlet.

The Salmon Creek Tidegates and Yontocket Slough Projects were not selected from specific inventories, but were recommended by resource agency staff as high priorities for coho salmon rearing habitat, as well as improved fish passage. The Salmon Creek Tidegates and Fish Passage Improvement Project is located within the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The tidegates at the mouth of the Salmon Creek Estuary had partially blocked fish access, caused poor tidal circulation and water quality conditions, and led to sedimentation of important estuarine habitat. New tidegates would eliminate the potential for adult and juvenile stranding and assist in restoring degraded rearing habitat to a usable condition. The project was a priority action item for the Salmon Creek Unit of the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge, the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon* and the Humboldt Bay Watershed Advisory Committee. Research has also demonstrated the importance of tidal estuaries and low gradient freshwater wetlands in the life history of anadromous salmonids. The Yontocket Slough Fish Passage and Habitat Enhancement project is located in Del Norte County, near the Smith River. It was identified in *The Yontocket Slough and Tryon Creek Assessment for Improvement of Anadromy*, *The Smith River Anadromous Fish Action Plan*, and the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon* as a limiting factor for anadromous salmonids due to poor access and habitat conditions. The project will restore over 100 acres of salmonid habitat by removing the non-native, invasive reed canary grass within the slough and improving passage conditions.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Detailed work plan descriptions for all projects funded under this grant agreement are included below in Task 4 – Migration Barrier Removal Project Planning.

Grant Agreement Objectives and Work Program Tasks

The objectives of this grant included:

- Design, obtain permits, and prepare for the implementation of twenty-six fish passage improvement projects in anadromous streams within the counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino and Trinity in which the initial design and placement of instream structures have created complete and partial fish passage barriers;
- Facilitate local and state governments and agencies, as well as private firms, with the development of designs and preparation for implementation of high priority fish passage improvement projects;
- Seek funding for implementation of the projects.

To achieve these objectives, the following tasks were developed and implemented:

Task 1 – Grant Administration

Conduct grant administration, conduct site assessments, coordinate meetings, prepare requests for proposals and develop contracts (subject to Coastal Conservancy review) for design components, manage invoicing, prepare progress and final reports, and transfer funds to contractors and the county departments.

Task 2 – Technical Advisory Team

Establish technical advisory teams with representatives from the resource agencies, and other qualified personnel, as needed, for various projects.

Task 3 – Fish Passage Design and Engineering Workshop

Provide a workshop for biologists and engineers on the most fish passage design and engineering, including innovative designs. A training video will also be produced from this workshop.

Task 4 – Migration Barrier Removal Project Planning

Complete engineering design, environmental documentation, geotechnical analysis hydraulic analysis, and other activities necessary for the development of twenty-six fish passage improvement projects (Table 1). A general map of the project locations is included as Attachment 2.

Task 1 – Grant Administration

The following work was performed under this task, with more detail included in Progress Reports 1-11 (January 20, 2004 through April 25, 2007). 5C staff prepared and reviewed responses to requests for proposals for design of the Caspar Creek, North and South Fork Ryan Creek, Fish Creek, and Conner Creek projects. Design contracts were prepared and approved (with Coastal Conservancy pre-

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

approval) by the Trinity County Board of Supervisors with six consulting firms for the above mentioned projects as well as Yontocket Slough and Salmon Creek Tidegates projects and the fish passage design workshop. Memorandums of Understanding with Humboldt, Mendocino, and Del Norte Counties were developed and approved as was an MOU with the Mendocino County Resource Conservation District for various county projects and the North Fork Schooner Gulch project. The aforementioned agreements were required for assuring completion of the work stipulated under each project and the transfer of funds to each entity.

IMPLEMENTING ENTITY	PROJECT
Del Norte County Community Development Department	Yonkers Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project and Griffin Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project
Humboldt County Department of Public Works	Painter Creek, Graham Gulch, Indian Creek, and Rocky Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Projects
Mendocino County Department of Transportation	Ancestor Creek, Ryan Creek, Dark Gulch, Marsh Creek and Albion River Migration Barrier Removal Projects
Mendocino County Resource Conservation District	North Fork Schooner Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project
Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife and Wetlands Restoration Association	Salmon Creek Tidegates Project
Winzler & Kelly Consulting Engineers	Caspar Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project
Michael Love & Associates	Yontocket Slough Fish Passage & Habitat Enhancement Project and Fish Passage Design & Engineering Workshop
Thomas B. Dunklin	Fish Passage Design & Engineering Workshop videography/training video
SHN Consulting Engineers & Geologists	Conner Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project
Gray Sky Engineering	Griffin Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project
Prunuske Chatham, Inc.	North and South Fork Ryan Creek and James L. Hamman Driveway Crossing

Table 2 - MOUs and contracts developed between Trinity County and various Counties and private consulting firms for design of projects

Task 2 – Technical Advisory Team

The Technical Advisory Team (TAT) component was established in order to evaluate the design of projects, track and assist with permitting, and coordinate agency criteria for design. Specific TAT's were developed for the Deadwood and Soldier Creek projects, the Caspar Creek project, the Conner Creek project, and the NF/SF Ryan Creek projects. More detail on each TAT is included in Progress Reports 1,3,5,6, and 7. TAT members participated in site visits and conference calls to establish design criteria for projects. They also reviewed and ranked responses to requests for proposals from consultants and provided 5C staff with engineering, biological and hydrological information. TAT's were composed of engineers, biologists, hydrologists and other personnel from the United States Forest Service (USFS), CDFG, NMFS, California Department of Forestry (CDF), and Caltrans. Similar agency personnel also assisted the individual County engineering departments with design and permitting of their projects, as jurisdictions allowed.

Task 3 – Fish Passage Design and Engineering Workshop

This task was developed to provide for a regional workshop on fish passage engineering to train biologists and engineers on the most up-to-date fish passage issues and innovative designs. The workshop included a mix of county, state and federal agency engineers, biologists, hydrologists, and private consulting firm personnel (refer to Progress Report #7 and the submitted Final Report CD for more detail on the workshop and its participants). The classroom portion of the workshop was at the Ukiah Valley Conference Center on March 7 and 8, 2006 with a field tour of completed and designed barrier sites on March 9. The classroom portion of the workshop included lectures by: Ken Bates (consulting professional engineer), George Heise (hydraulic engineer, CDFG), Michael Love (consulting hydraulic engineer) and Ross Taylor (consulting fisheries biologist). Guest speakers included Howard Dashiell (Mendocino County Director of Transportation and engineer), Chris Whitworth (Humboldt County Public Works Deputy Director and engineer) and Jon Mann (consulting professional engineer). Primary topics included: 1) design guidelines for state and federal agencies; 2) stream simulation techniques; 3) culvert retrofits; 4) project monitoring; and, 5) case studies. Group exercises on both days allowed participants to work cooperatively in assessing sample barrier sites and to propose solutions using information that they had learned. One critique of the workshop was the request for more calculations and in-depth review of the engineering required for project design. Because of this request, the next workshop (to be held by FishNet 4C in March 2007) would include a session on engineering calculations.

Due to the overwhelming response of interested participants during the 5C workshop registration period, and the expressed need for this type of training, Thomas Dunklin was contracted to record the workshop proceedings and produce a training video. The footage from the March 2006 workshop, and the Engineering Practicum in March 2007, were produced into a 4-disk training DVD that will be distributed to: University engineering departments; 5C, Fishnet 4C, and Tri-County FISH Team engineering staff; State and Federal agency personnel; and, watershed groups. The lectures are also available to the general public through a link on the FishXing website (www.fishxing.org). The CDFG Adaptive Management Program and the NOAA Restoration Center funded recording and production of the March 2006 workshop DVDs. The March 2007 filming and production of the engineering practicum DVD was funded under this grant agreement. The training DVD is included as a deliverable with this report.

Task 4 – Migration Barrier Removal Project Planning

This task represents the majority of the work completed under this grant agreement and was developed to track completion of the engineering design, environmental documentation and necessary permitting, geotechnical analysis, hydraulic analysis, and other activities necessary to fully design the following fish passage improvement projects. The following constitutes the work plans and completed tasks for each project and final reports for construction and/or design are included where applicable.

COUNTY ROAD PROJECTS

Del Norte

Griffin Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project

This project is located within the Smith River watershed, approximately 35 miles northeast of Crescent City in Del Norte County on Oregon Mountain Road (County Road #324). Griffin Creek currently hosts populations of resident Coastal cutthroat trout in the upstream reaches and is an important spawning and rearing tributary for coho and steelhead with approximately 3.7 miles of high quality habitat. It is the second highest priority in Del Norte County (assessed during the second round of County Road migration barrier inventory in coastal watersheds - Ross Taylor & Associates, 2003-2004). The existing 36" diameter, 120-foot long culvert was not assessed with FishXing software due to safety issues, but was identified as a complete barrier to all age classes during all migration flows because of the buried inlet and perched, degraded outlet.



Griffin Creek #2

Outlet of 36" Culvert

Upstream Habitat

Oregon Mountain Road—Del Norte County

The new culvert design meets with NOAA Fisheries Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings for the 100-year flow (calculated at 224 cfs) and is a 7-foot diameter, 130 feet long steel culvert. It will be bored through the existing roadfill and 36" culvert at a 1-2% slope and embedded utilizing the "Active Channel Design" option. This is a simplified design option that sizes a crossing sufficiently large and embedded deep enough into the channel to allow for the natural movement of bedload and formation of a stable streambed inside the culvert. A properly sized, embedded culvert was deemed the most appropriate design for this site's specific characteristics in order to reduce future sediment accumulation at the inlet, reduce the risk of catastrophic roadfill failure, and provide fish passage to upstream habitat. Tasks funded under this grant agreement included the surveying, hydraulic analysis, and civil/structural engineering. The topographical and thalweg survey of the crossing was conducted by 5C staff member Carolyn Rourke and Ron Borth of the Del Norte County Road Department (in-kind). Juris Mergups of the Del Norte County Community Development Department completed the hydraulic analysis, including modeling of 100-year flows, and portions of the civil engineering. This project incorporates a fairly new construction technique of

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

boring through the fill as excavation of the existing 6,500 cubic yard fill would be cost prohibitive. Gray Sky Engineering was contracted to complete design for the boring platform required to implement this project. This project has construction funding under the 2006/2007 DFG Fisheries Restoration Grant Program (FRGP) and the CEQA and permitting will be conducted and funded by CDFG. This project will allow passage through the crossing and prevent the catastrophic delivery of approximately 6,500 cubic yards of sediment to the downstream reaches of Griffin Creek. Construction is planned for 2008 and 50% design plans for the new crossing were included with Progress Report #11. The plans are also included on the submitted Final Report CD.

Yonkers Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

This project is located on Wonderstump Road in Del Norte County and crosses a small coastal tributary to Lake Earl, just north of Crescent City. This project was designed in 2004 and constructed in 2006 within the timeframe of this grant. It now provides unimpeded access for coho, steelhead and Coastal cutthroat trout to 1.7 miles of upstream spawning and rearing habitat. FishXing analysis determined the 6-foot diameter, 61-foot long culvert (with perched outlet and steep slope) as a complete barrier to adult Coastal cutthroat and all juvenile species due to the excessive velocities within the culvert and outlet barrier. It was replaced with a 15-foot wide by 8-foot high natural bottom aluminum arch structure, designed under the "stream simulation" design method (sizing the structure at 1.45 times the active channel width). This crossing was the last high priority barrier identified in the first run of the Del Norte County barrier inventory (Taylor & Associates, 2000).



Yonkers Creek Wonderstump Road—Del Norte County

Due to the higher costs of relocating a 12-inch and 24-inch waterline beneath the road if a bridge had been constructed, the design option of an arched culvert was selected. The waterlines were re-installed in the culvert roadfill after project construction. This project was partially funded for construction under the 2004/2005 CDFG FRGP and was included in the 2005 CDFG Mitigated Negative Declaration. All other permits (1602, 404, 401 and a Del Norte County grading

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

permit) were secured prior to implementation. The design elements funded under this grant agreement included the geo-technical investigation, hydraulic analysis for the 100-year flow (317 cfs), development of a suitable channel shape and substrate/rock sizing to provide adequate fish passage conditions (roughened channel and portions of the structural engineering. A final report on project construction is included on the submitted Final Report CD.

Humboldt

Graham Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project

Graham Gulch is a tributary to Freshwater Creek in Humboldt County. The project was constructed in 2005 and provides unimpeded access to 2.5 miles of habitat for coho, steelhead and Coastal cutthroat trout. The 13.25-foot diameter, 60.5-foot long metal culvert was replaced with a 18-foot wide, 9-foot high corrugated metal arch culvert set on concrete footings, allowing for complete passage of all species and life stages and the 100-year flows. The perched outlet, with ineffective steel-ramp baffles, was the primary migration barrier for adults and juveniles.

Observations were made on numerous occasions, prior to replacement, of both age classes making failed attempts at the culvert outlet. This project received funding from 2003/2004 CDFG FRGP and was included in the 2004 Mitigated Negative Declaration. This grant agreement funded the site surveying, hydraulic analysis, and portions of the civil engineering. A final report on project construction is included on the submitted Final Report CD.



Graham Gulch

Before & After


Palco Camp Road, Humboldt County
Tributary to Freshwater Creek

Indian Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

Indian Creek is a tributary to the Mattole River in southern Humboldt County with approximately 1.2 miles of high quality coho and steelhead spawning and rearing habitat located upstream. It is a high priority stream due to its cool-water refugia, boulder/cobble-dominant channel, dense riparian zone of conifers, and good flows in late summer for over-summering juveniles. The existing crossing is a 10-foot wide, 48-foot long concrete box culvert in a shallow fill, perched 2-3 feet at its outlet. Shallow flow through the culvert at low flows, excessive velocities at migration flows, and the outlet jump all contribute to barrier status. The project has construction funding from the 2003/2004 CDFG FRGP and the National Association of Counties (NACO) National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) grant

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

program. It was included in the 2004 CDFG FRGP Mitigated Negative Declaration and all other construction permits have been secured by Humboldt County. This grant agreement funded the geotechnical analysis, site surveying, hydraulic analysis and a portion of the structural design. The proposed design was to replace the existing culvert with a 55-foot long concrete bridge. The project was ready for construction in 2006 but no bids were received. The project has since been redesigned and is planned for construction in 2007, pending receipt of bids within the construction budget. Humboldt County engineering and Morrison Structures have designed a pile-less bridge structure with shallower abutments using a box girder design instead of a concrete slab. Design plans are included in Attachment 3 and on the submitted Final Report CD.



Indian Creek
Tributary to
Mattole River

Humboldt County

Mattole Road

Painter Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

The Shelter Cover Road crossing of Painter Creek has approximately one mile of habitat upstream for coho, Chinook and steelhead. This project is also in the Mattole River watershed and would replace the existing 8-foot, 53-foot long concrete box culvert which is perched 3-5 feet at the outlet with a bottomless metal arch culvert set on concrete grade beams. The upstream habitat is considered good with cool-water flows during the summer. Coho and steelhead juveniles have been observed in the outlet pool on numerous occasions. The Painter Creek crossing is similar to several other County culverts in the Whitethorne area, which were built on siltstone bedrock. The result is that the culverts have become perched at their outlets and bedload has built up at the inlets, covering the base flow pools that harbor young of the year. This grant agreement funded the hydraulic analysis, surveying and a portion of the civil and structural engineering. This project is partially designed and had funding from the 2003/2004 CDFG FRGP and was included in the 2004 CDFG FRGP Mitigated Negative Declaration. Final design could not be completed in the timeframe of this grant agreement and additional funding for completing design and engineering will be sought under other federal and state grant sources, or funded by Humboldt County.

Rocky Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project



Rocky Gulch
Outlet at High Flows
Humboldt County

Rocky Gulch is a 1.5 square mile watershed that drains into North Humboldt Bay, approximately six miles north of Eureka. It historically supported coho salmon and steelhead populations, but past timber and agricultural land-uses caused extirpation of these populations by the early 1960's. The County maintained crossing (part of the "*Rocky Gulch Salmonid Access and Habitat Restoration Project*") is located on Old Arcata Road approximately 5,000 feet upstream of the confluence with the Bay. The crossing consists of two 36-inch diameter, 48-foot long culverts. They are undersized, with a capacity for less than a 2-year storm event and the high –flows through the culverts during migration flows result in a velocity barrier for all age classes and species. The current design options are to replace the culverts with either a countersunk metal box or pipe-arch culvert

with a low, broad cross-section that allows for native bedload accumulation. Either design will create a natural stream bottom within the new structure, allowing for full passage of all life stages. There is approximately 2.7 miles of habitat upstream of the county crossing with several private barrier crossings that are also being addressed. Project construction is scheduled for 2007. Design elements funded under this grant agreement included the site surveying, hydraulic analysis, digital terrain modeling, conceptual designs for the crossing, a site restoration plan, and a portion of the structural engineering. This project has construction funding from the 2004/2005 CDFG FRGP and was included in the 2005 CDFG FRGP Mitigated Negative Declaration. A Final Report on the "*Rocky Gulch Salmonid Access and Habitat Restoration Project*" was completed (includes the County culvert) and was submitted with Progress Report #9. The report is also included on the submitted Final Report CD.

Mendocino

Ancestor Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

This project is located on Briceland Road in the Mattole River watershed. It will provide unimpeded access to two miles of good quality upstream anadromous spawning and rearing habitat for coho salmon and steelhead by replacing the existing culvert with a properly sized, embedded culvert. The crossing is located approximately 500 feet upstream of the confluence with the Mattole and for the range of migration flows, FishXing predicted it to be a complete barrier for adults and juveniles of all species and age classes. The existing 7-foot diameter, 40-foot long culvert set at a 3.8% grade will be replaced with a 16-foot wide, 40-foot long multi-plate pipe-arch structure. This culvert will be embedded, utilizing the "Active Channel" design method. The upstream habitat consists of a dense riparian zone of conifers and hardwoods, numerous pools, ample areas of spawning-sized gravels,

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

and cool-water temperatures during the late summer flows. Access to this type of habitat, especially for over-summering juveniles, is critical for juvenile survival. Numerous juveniles have been observed in outlet pool and Ancestor Creek is a known coho-bearing tributary in the upper Mattole. The geotechnical analysis for this project was completed with funding from an existing 5C Program grant and this grant agreement funded the following design elements: hydraulic analysis, right of way negotiations, and structural design. The project received 85% funding for construction from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board in 2002 (Proposition 13 funds) but the Mendocino DOT was unable to construct the project due in part to landowner issues with a proposed road closure and lack of grade control in the first conceptual design (concrete arch). The project has been re-designed and includes a construction period detour plan. This is the highest priority project in the 5C Program area and a NFWF Keystone grant for 2008 construction was submitted in April 2007 (not funded) and a re-application to the CDFG FRGP for 2008 construction has been submitted.

Albion River & Marsh Creek Migration Barrier Removal Projects

These projects are located on Flynn Creek Road within the Albion River Watershed. The existing circular culverts on the Albion River and Marsh Creek were complete barriers to all age classes of coho salmon and steelhead. Barrier status was



Albion River



Marsh Creek

Both constructed in 2006

Flynn Creek Road—Mendocino County

primarily due to the excessive velocities over the concrete culvert linings, the lack of depth at lower migration flows, and the leap required to enter the culverts. The culverts were replaced in 2006 with open-bottom, pre-manufactured concrete arch structures, providing for full passage of all species and life stages and the 100-year flows. This project has allowed access to approximately five miles of historic spawning and rearing habitat upstream of the crossings, approximately one mile on Marsh Creek and four miles on the Albion River. Both projects were constructed at the same time due to their proximity in location as well as their high priority rankings (#3 and #5 in Mendocino County). Conducting the environmental review and permitting for both projects at once was cost effective and sequential implementation reduced the overall environmental impact and construction costs. This grant agreement funded the following design elements: site surveying, geotechnical analysis, and the civil and structural engineering. The project was

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

funded for construction under the 2001/2002 CDFG FRGP and the NOAA American Rivers grant program. Design plans were submitted with Progress Report #6 and are included on the submitted Final Report CD, along with a draft final report on project construction.

Ryan Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

Ryan Creek is located in the Outlet Creek sub-watershed of the North Fork Eel River. Outlet Creek one of the highest priority coho watersheds identified in the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon*. The existing culvert is a 10-foot wide, 6-foot high, 82-foot long concrete box and is proposed for full replacement with a 19-foot wide, 82-foot long concrete arch structure set on concrete footings. The existing culvert was assessed as 20% passable for adults coho, Chinook, and steelhead and as a complete barrier for all age classes of juveniles due to the excessive velocities and outlet jump. The broken concrete apron at the outlet is also a major impediment to fish migration. Approximately 500 feet of good quality habitat exists between the county Ryan Creek crossing and the two Caltrans crossings (North and South Fork) located upstream (all of these crossings were designed under this grant agreement and are described below). CDFG surveyed the SF in 1995 (NF was denied entry) and estimated 6,000 feet of upstream habitat. During the Caltrans District 1 Inventory there was estimated to be 9,000 feet of upstream habitat. When all of the barriers in this portion of the watershed (including a private crossing on the SF that was also designed under this grant agreement) are treated, approximately 15,500 feet or 3 miles will be made accessible to Chinook and coho salmon and steelhead.



Ryan Creek
Ryan Creek Road—
Tributary to Outlet
Creek
Mendocino County

Design elements funded under this grant agreement for the county project included the hydraulic analysis, site surveying, and a portion of the structural engineering. Mendocino County conducted CEQA for this project and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was filed in March 2003. All construction permits have been secured by the County and CDFG and the project is scheduled for constructed in 2007. It has funding from the 2001/2002 CDFG FRGP and potentially the Coastal Conservancy and Steelhead Restoration Card Program. Design plans are included as Attachment 4 and on the submitted Final Report CD.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Dark Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project

This project is located at the Orr Springs Road crossing of Dark Gulch, a tributary to South Fork Big River. The existing culvert is a 7-foot diameter, 90-foot long corrugated steel pipe set at 3.29% slope. The culvert is in poor condition, rusted through the bottom in several places and is a complete barrier for all species and



Dark Gulch

Orr Springs Road—Tributary to Big River

age classes of salmonids, due mostly to the excessive velocities within the culvert, lack of depth at the lower migration flows, and the leap required to enter the culvert. The culvert is retrofit with a concrete lining and boulder weir placement at the outlet. However, the modification has failed to raise the elevation of the outlet pool and still results in a 1.8 foot drop. Implementation of this project will restore access to approximately 1 mile of habitat for coho salmon and steelhead. Dark Gulch flows into the South Fork Big River just below the crossing. The upstream habitat consists of a dense riparian canopy of conifers and hardwoods and

small bedrock-formed pools. Replacement of the culvert with a bridge that provides for passage of adults and juveniles is the current conceptual design. The project is 60% designed and not scheduled for construction until at least 2009. Final design could not be completed in the timeframe under this Grant Agreement and additional funding for completing design and construction will be sought under other federal and state grant sources. The geotechnical analysis was funded under a CDFG FRGP grant through the 5C Program and this grant agreement funded the following design elements: site surveying, hydraulic analysis and modeling of the proposed crossing for the 100-year flows.

Trinity

Conner Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project

This project is located in the Trinity River Watershed near Junction City and consists of improving passage at two crossings, located on Conner Creek Road (#1) and Red Hill Road (#2). Crossing #1 currently consists of a 14-foot wide, 17-foot long concrete box culvert with three, 1-foot high offset baffles spanning the lower half of the culvert bottom. The baffles plug with woody debris and are non-functional for providing resting places and slowing water velocities to allow for passage. The culvert is a complete barrier to juveniles and adults due to the outlet jump and the velocities during migration flows. Crossing #2 is located approximately 1,100 feet upstream of Crossing #1 and is a 10-foot, 66-foot long corrugated steel culvert set at 3.17% slope with ten steel-ramp offset baffles. It fails to meet passage criteria for adult salmonids on ~45% of migration flows and is a complete barrier for all age

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

classes of juveniles at all flows. These projects were proposed for simultaneous design due to their proximity. The ability to conduct environmental review and permitting for both projects at once will better address the cumulative effects and will be more cost effective, as will construction. Given the time constraints and workload on the Trinity County Department of Transportation (TCDOT) engineering staff, the project's design was contracted to SHN Consulting Engineers and Geologists. Design elements funded under this grant agreement included:

- 1) The formation of and meetings with the Technical Advisory Team (TAT) members to establish design criteria (TCDOT staff, CDFG and NMFS personnel, Mike Love and 5C staff);
- 2) Preparation of the RFP for design consultants and review/selection of a design firm based on responses to the RFP;
- 3) Site visits with the TAT;
- 4) Topographical and thalweg surveying at both crossings;
- 5) Hydraulic analysis and modeling (HEC-RAS and FishXing) for replacement and retrofit options of both crossings;
- 6) A conceptual design report for all four options and cost estimates for construction; and,
- 7) The design plans for the selected retrofit options.

A construction proposal under the CDFG FRGP will be submitted in 2007 for 2008 construction. If the project is funded, it will be included in the CDFG Mitigated Negative Declaration along with other permitting. The retrofit design options for both crossings will allow passage of adult and juvenile coho and steelhead during all migration flows. Each crossing's current flow capacity will also be increased to convey the 100-year flow and 50-year flow, respectively. The conceptual design report is included as Attachment 5 and is on the submitted Final Report CD. It includes design plans for both project sites, the hydraulic analyses, cost estimates for construction, and permitting requirements.



Conner Creek #1



Conner Creek #2



Upstream Habitat

Tributary to Trinity River—Trinity County

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Deadwood Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

The purpose of this project was to provide for passage of all life stages of coho and Chinook salmon and steelhead to the natural limit of anadromy (waterfall) of Deadwood Creek and to increase the flood-flow capacity through the road crossing at Deadwood Road in Lewiston. The existing culvert is an 8-foot diameter, 120-foot long corrugated metal pipe. It was identified as meeting passage criteria for all species of adult salmonids during approximately 12% of adult migration flows and on less than 5% of migration flows for all age classes of juveniles. The design was completed using an informal TAT of the following federal, state, local and county staff: NOAA Fisheries Branch, CDFG, Trinity County Resource Conservation District, Trinity County Department of Transportation, Trinity County Building and Development Services, Mendocino County Department of Transportation and 5C staff. The installation of baffles was determined to be the most cost-effective design for improving adult and juvenile passage during 100% of migration flows. 48-inch diameter overflow culverts were also designed to compensate for the reduced capacity of the culvert with the baffles installed. This project was ranked as the 3rd highest priority in Trinity County due to the quantity and quality of habitat available upstream, approximately 2 miles, and the consistent presence of coho, steelhead and Chinook in the stream system. The 2004 *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon* also identifies Deadwood Creek a high priority watershed for coho based on population, habitat condition and at-risk factors. The engineering and permitting elements funded under this grant agreement were completed in 2003/2004 and included completing and securing the CDFG 1602 and ACOE 404 permits as well as the preparation and submittal of the CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration (Trinity County). Topographical/thalweg surveying and portions of the civil engineering for the baffle design were also included under this agreement. A final report on project construction was submitted with Progress Report #6 and it is also included on the submitted Final Report CD.

Little Browns Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

This project is located on Roundy Road, approximately 6 miles north of Weaverville. It is the second highest priority in the 5C Program area and the highest in Trinity County. It was included in the 2004 *Inventory of Barriers to Fish Passage in California's Coastal Watersheds* (Coastal Conservancy) as a high priority and identified during the environmental analysis completed by USFS for their planned 'Browns Project' as the highest priority treatment in the watershed. The project site is surrounded by private property, but the majority of the upper watershed is managed by the USFS. The crossing is a complete barrier to adult and juvenile coho and steelhead and their inadequate size and placement has resulted in upstream sediment aggradation. There is an estimated 1,400 cubic yards of upstream stored sediment, a direct result of the improperly placed culverts, that could deliver to the downstream reaches of Little Browns Creek if not treated. This sediment will be mobilized over time as the removal of the culverts will result in upstream headcutting and erosion. The final design includes plans for upstream grade control to reduce the impacts of upstream headcutting and sediment intrusion. Coho presence surveys have consistently found coho in Weaver Creek and young-of-the-year (y-o-y) steelhead were observed in 2001. In 2000 and

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

2001, y-o-y coho were sampled in the creek downstream of the project site. From 1986 to 1992, the Creek had in-stream habitat structures installed in its lower reaches, which have provided more complex rearing habitat for juveniles. Habitat surveys conducted upstream of the project site rated it as good quality due to the presence of stones, logs, brush and aquatic macrophytes. The stream is currently designated as 'Critical Habitat' for the SONCC coho ESU up to the county barrier.



Little Browns Creek
Roundy Road
Tributary to Weaver Creek
Trinity County

The existing crossing consists of three, 4-foot diameter, 50-foot long metal culverts all of which are undersized with ~8-foot jumps at their outlets. The proposed design consists of a 30-foot long concrete bridge (developed by TCDOT engineering staff). Consulting hydrologist, Mike Love, was contracted (under a matching grant source) to assist with the upstream grade control design. A roughened channel consisting of ten rock weir structures and engineered streambed material was developed. The permitting for this project is currently in progress. A categorical exemption under Section 15333 was prepared and filed in December 2006 and the ACOE 404 notification and 401 water quality certification were filed in March 2007. Site visits were held on April 13, 2007 with David Ammerman (ACOE) and Jan Smith (DOT) to discuss the 404 permit and on April 23, 2007 with Mike Harris (CDFG) to discuss the stream alteration

agreement. Dean Prat of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) has been assigned to completing the 401 permit process. 5C staff worked continuously with Margaret Tauzer and Rick Rogers of NMFS on development and approval of the design and NOAA Biological Opinion. The project is "approved" by all of the resource agencies at this time and construction bids came in at or near the engineers estimated cost. The project is scheduled for construction in 2007. Design elements funded under this grant agreement included site surveying, hydraulic analysis, civil/structural engineering, and permitting. The geotechnical analysis and roughened channel design were funded by 5C Program grants (CDFG). The design plans are included as Attachment 6 and on the submitted Final Report CD, along with other design deliverables.

Soldier Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

This project is located in the Trinity River Watershed near Junction City. Both crossings are located on Soldier Creek on Evans Bar (#1) and Dutch Creek Roads (#2). Crossing #1 is located approximately 800 feet from the Trinity River with Crossing #2 located approximately 2,400 feet upstream. The culverts at both crossings were replaced in 2005 with 23-foot wide metal-arch, natural bottom structures. The new structures were designed to convey 100-year flows for the watershed and provide full passage for all age classes and species of salmonids. The old culverts were approximately 30-feet long, 8-foot diameter metal pipes with

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

ineffective baffles and outlet jumps. They would often plug with woody debris during large storms, resulting in flooding of nearby private properties, diversion and sediment delivery down the roads, and repeated maintenance issues/costs for the TCDOT. The removal of the two barriers has provided access to approximately 2 miles of good quality rearing habitat for coho and steelhead. These projects were simultaneously designed and implemented because of their proximity as well as their high priority rankings (#7 and #8 in Trinity County). A single CEQA/NEPA document addressing both projects was completed and permitting fees for one construction application were substantially less than the fees for separate projects. The sequential implementation of these projects also reduced the environmental impacts and construction costs were reduced due to: one-time mobilization of equipment and crews, simpler contract management, and lower engineering and construction costs. Geotechnical analysis for both sites was completed in January 2004 under a 5C Program grant (CDFG). The Trinity County Building and Development Services staff completed the civil and structural engineering and hydraulic analysis with assistance from the TCDOT engineering staff.



Solider Creek in February 2004
Dutch Creek Road



Solider Creek in December 2005
Dutch Creek Road

Specific design elements funded under this grant agreement included:

- 1) Topographical/thalweg surveying;
- 2) Hydraulic analysis;
- 3) Environmental Permitting and Documentation;
 - a. CEQA Initial Study and Negative Declaration
 - b. CDFG Streambed Alteration Agreement (1602 permit)
 - c. NEPA- Initial Study and Categorical Exclusion
 - d. ACOE RGP #1 (Regional General Permit For Fish Passage/Sediment Reduction Projects At Water Crossings Notification package)
 - e. NOAA RGP #1 Tiering Letter
- 4) Structural Engineering and Design;
- 5) Preparation of construction bid package and advertisement.

A final report was submitted with Progress Report #11 and is also included on the submitted Final Report CD.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

For each of the following projects, 5C Program staff administered the funding through Trinity County and developed/assisted in the formulation and facilitation of design tasks with the various government agencies, consulting firms and project proponents. The staff time expended on these projects was proportionately higher than on the County road projects listed above. This expenditure was due to greater project design oversight requirements, including: development of design criteria with multiple stakeholders, information gathering, private landowner contacts, travel to site visits, overall facilitation of design tasks, and conference calls/sit-down meetings on various projects.

Private Road Projects

North Fork Schooner Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project

This project is located between the Gualala and Garcia River watersheds, approximately three miles southeast of Point Arena in Mendocino County. It is within both the Central California Coast coho and Northern California Steelhead ESU. The existing crossing consists of a 4-foot diameter, 100-foot long corrugated steel pipe with perched outlet. The culvert is rusted through the bottom, has a failing center structure and a high plug potential all within a large roadfill (estimated at 2,700 cubic yards). It was referenced in the 2001 DFG *Stream Inventory Report*, which recommends "the active and potential sediment delivery from roads and other sources in the Schooner Gulch watershed be treated". It was also referenced in the 2004 *Inventory of barriers to fish passage in California's Coastal Watersheds* as a high priority for sediment reduction and fish passage improvement. For this reason, the project was selected as a Task 4 "Work Program" element for design when this grant agreement was augmented with additional funding in 2005. The crossing is a complete barrier to juveniles and adults due to length of the culvert, velocities at migration flows and the perched outlet. The 5C and Trinity County contracted with the Mendocino County Resource Conservation District (RCD), notably Janet Olave (Director), on design. Design work began with a July 2005 site visit that included Olave, Teri Barber (project hydrologist), Alan Grass and Doug Albin (CDFG), Danny Hagans of Pacific Watershed Associates (PWA), Ron Dickerson of Trout Unlimited, and 5C staff. The two design options, a bridge or an embedded culvert, were discussed and due to the switchback configuration of the road (and a landslide near the proposed southern bridge abutment), replacement with an embedded culvert was determined as the most cost-effective treatment. 5C staff member, Carolyn Rourke, conducted the topographical surveying for the project site with in-kind assistance from the RCD and USDA-NRCS and Teri Barber assembled watershed and flow data. This information, along with the topographical survey data, was provided to Erin O'Farrell (agricultural engineer, NRCS) for use in the hydraulic analysis (HEC-RAS) modeling of the proposed design. Joe Scriven (fisheries biologist) conducted a habitat assessment up and downstream of the project site in January 2007. The RCD also contracted with Westcoast Watershed to develop the revegetation plan for the project (see Attachment 7). Olave proceeded with structural design of the embedded culvert by contracting Rau & Associates out of Ukiah. Rau developed

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

design plans for the culvert (sized at 12-foot diameter) to be embedded approximately half way into the streambed, utilizing the "Active Channel Design" method. The design also incorporates up and downstream grade control and several road surface treatments not related to the stream crossing. These elements, along with the shoring required for the construction of the new culvert, resulted in a construction estimate of ~\$441,000. A construction proposal for the 2006/2007 CDFG FRGP was submitted but not funded because of the high costs. Various re-design options are currently in consideration, including utilizing an arch shaped culvert from Mendocino Redwood Company (MRC) and/or removal of the road treatments proposed in the barrier replacement design. As designed, the embedded 12-foot culvert is the best option for the site characteristics. When the project is constructed it will provide access to 2 miles of upstream spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead and coho (see *Fisheries Report* included in Attachment 7). It will also reduce the potential sediment delivery of ~2,700 cubic yards by removing the large roadfill and potential for culvert failure. The existing design plans developed by Rau & Associates were submitted with Progress Report #8 and are included on the submitted Final Report CD.

South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project - James L. Hamman Driveway Crossing

The design portion of this project was completed by Prunuske Chatham, Inc. in conjunction with the North Fork and South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project designs. The crossing is located approximately six miles north of Willits in Mendocino County and is a private driveway over the South Fork of Ryan Creek (~300 feet upstream of the SF Caltrans crossing). Refer to the *South Fork Ryan Creek James L. Hamman Driveway Crossing Scoping Report for Fish Passage Improvement* included on the submitted Final Report CD and the discussion below for the North Fork and South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement Projects for more detail. Design plans are included as Attachment 8 and on the submitted Final Report CD.



South Fork Ryan Creek—Hamman Driveway Culverts
Southerly Culvert Northerly Culvert
Tributary to Outlet Creek

Federal and State Ownership Projects

Caspar Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project

The goal of this project was to facilitate USFS Redwood Sciences Lab (RSL) and CDF Jackson Demonstration State Forest staff in designing replacement structures for the North and South Fork Caspar Creek fish ladders. The watershed hosts populations of Central California Coast coho salmon and Northern California steelhead which are listed as endangered and threatened, respectively. A design of replacement ladders, other "fishways" that would improve passage for both adults and juveniles without disturbing the integrity of current data collection, specifically not backwatering the V-notch weirs used to measure watershed flows, was the primary design criteria. The Caspar Creek watershed is located within the Jackson Demonstration State Forest, approximately five miles south of Fort Bragg in Mendocino County. For the last forty years, stream flow and suspended sediment have been monitored continuously as part of a paired-watershed study. The project sites consist of concrete V-notch flow-gauging weir dams, redwood dams that regulate the water surface beneath the weirs, and wooden fish ladders. The existing wooden dams and fish ladders are in poor condition with 90% of the stream flow leaking through the structures during low summer flows, trapping fish upstream until the fall rains. In May 2001, Robert Floerke (Regional Manager, CDFG Central Coast Region) submitted a Memorandum to CDF that the existing ladders were a partial barrier to fish passage and recommended their replacement. Jeffrey Jahn, NMFS biologist, issued a biological opinion in 2003 that covered the weir pond cleanouts (conducted bi-annually by CDF/RSL as part of the study) and the replacement of the ladders (when designed). From 2001 to 2004, no progress was made in developing a design for the new ladders. In order to expedite development of this project, the Coastal Conservancy recommended the project for inclusion in this grant's work program. The Conservancy also authorized disbursement of \$600,000 to CDF in May 18, 2005 for the purpose of implementing the project following successful completion of the design. From March 2005 to February 2007, 5C staff administered the preparation of the existing final design (concrete ladder with low flow sluice gates & labyrinth weir, roughened channel, and monitoring capability) for full replacement of both redwood fish ladders. The design was prepared by: Winzler & Kelly Consulting Engineers (W/K), Michael Love & Associates, and Taber Consultants. Unfortunately, this process was hampered by extensive and often late-to-arrive project recommendations from both NOAA staff and RSL.

Design elements funded under this grant program included:

- 1) Assemblage of a Technical Advisory Team (TAT) including Marcin Whitman & Brad Valentine (CDFG), Jeffrey Jahn, Rick Wantuck & Margaret Tauzer (NMFS), Marc Jameson & Fay Yee (CDF), Tom Lisle, Rod Nakamoto, Jack Lewis & Elizabeth Keppeler (USFS RSL), and later Steven Allen (W/K) & Michael Love (MLove);
- 2) Development & release of the RFP for engineering and rating criteria to select a consultant including a legal notice in the Ukiah Daily Journal;

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

- 3) Formulation (March/April 2005) & revision (January 2006) of the design criteria for the V-notch weirs and juvenile/adult fish passage;
- 4) Information gathering & data transfer between TAT members, including research on 1) alternative flow measurement devices (consultation with USGS staff & consulting hydrologist Greg Kamman), and 2) video monitoring & viewport structural design information;
- 5) Four sit-down meetings & numerous conference calls:

MEETINGS

- March 11, 2005 Initial Site Visit;
- April 21, 2005 Design Criteria Meeting for adult/juvenile passage (Whitman, Jahn, Jordan, Taylor, Lancaster);
- August 18, 2005 Site Visit with Consultant & CDF/USFS staff;
- January 10, 2006 Introduction of Rick Wantuck to TAT & modified design criteria: 1) improved passage for adults/juveniles and, 2) integration of video monitoring & viewport windows into ladder structures.

KEY CONFERENCE CALLS

- July 28, 2005 Review of consultant responses to engineering RFP & ranking/selection of Winzler & Kelly team;
 - October 20 & 27, 2005 Discussion of *Preliminary Design Clarification* letter from W/K, specifically the flow measurement at which the V-notch could not be backwatered - set at 400 cfs (RSL staff).
- 6) Geotechnical investigation (Taber); Site surveying (W/K); Complete civil and structural engineering; Development of draft *Operations & Maintenance Manual*; and, draft/final designs, plans & specifications (W/K & MLove);
 - 7) Coordination with permitting agencies (CDFG – Brad Valentine; NMFS & ACOE – Jeffrey Jahn);
 - 8) Posting of all pertinent information on the CDF website;
 - 9) Circulation of draft and final design plans and reports to TAT members.



North Fork Caspar Creek


Wood dams & fish ladder Low flow between ladders & weir dams
Jackson Demonstration State Forest—Mendocino County

The final design (plans/specifications, draft O& M Manual & construction estimate) was circulated to various TAT members and per the NOAA Biological Opinion, RSL

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

staff reviewed the design and submitted it to NMFS for review and approval. Wantuck and Whitman approved the design in December 2006. CDF is responsible for administering the implementation funding, preparing the construction bid package, and overseeing construction. At this time, at least one ladder is planned for construction in 2007 and the other in 2008. CDF has contacted W/K regarding a construction oversight and inspection contract, critical to ensure that the ladder structures are constructed as-designed. 5C staff has continuously sought, notified CDF of, and written construction grant applications to supplement the existing \$600,000 in construction funding from the Conservancy, effectively serving as CDF's project proponent for this undertaking. A NOAA Community Based Habitat Restoration Project Grant Program proposal and a NFWF Keystone Grant pre-proposal were submitted in 2006 and 2007 (preparation funded under subsequent grant source). When implemented, this project will improve access to 3.5 miles of rearing and spawning habitat for threatened steelhead and endangered coho salmon in the Caspar Creek watershed. Design plans were submitted with Progress Report #10 as a CD of plans, specifications, and the O&M Manual, and are also included on the submitted Final Report CD.

Salmon Creek Tidegates Fish Passage Improvement Project



Salmon Creek Tidegates

Installed 5' x 8' Tidegate, January 2007
Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge

This project is located within the Salmon Creek Unit of the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The project consists of replacing two existing sets of tidegates and installing an additional tidegate where one had previously existed within the Salmon Creek Estuary. The tidegates had partially blocked fish access, caused poor tidal circulation and water quality conditions, and led to sedimentation of important juvenile rearing estuarine habitat. Analysis of environmental impacts associated with this project included hydrologic modeling to

evaluate the potential impacts that various tidegate configurations would have on the following: tidal circulation, fish passage, flooding, and sediment routing. The final design included pre-manufactured tidegate structures from Nehalem Marine, located in Oregon, that provide for unimpeded access of migrating adults and juveniles at all ebbing tides using a vertical hinged gate. Two of the structures include adjustable sluice gates that allow for a muted tide cycle, improving water quality and increasing the quantity and quality of estuarine habitat. The third structure eliminates the potential for adult and juvenile stranding during flooding and low tides. Salmonid species known to utilize Salmon Creek and the estuary include steelhead, Coastal cutthroat, coho and Chinook salmon. Preparation of the environmental documents and permit applications required for construction, assisting the USFWS with the NEPA process, and obtaining permits were the primary design elements funded under this grant agreement. The lead agency (USFWS) completed the necessary NEPA review through the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge (HBNWR) Management Plan and obtained the following permits:

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

DFG 1602; RWQCB Sec. 401; ACOE 404; Coastal Development; Humboldt County Grading Permit; Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District CEQA Categorical Exemption under Section 15333; and, a Cooperative Agreement with HBNWR. Consultation with NMFS biologists was also conducted as part of the 404 permit process. Other design elements funded under this agreement included: topographical surveys of the proposed tidegate locations, collection of site data, construction phase environmental impacts analysis, and final engineered designs. From January 2004 – January 2005 the following were completed:

- 1) Design level topographic mapping of 4 project locations, including bathymetry of portions of Hookton Slough (includes detailed site specific topographic maps & improved/expanded overall project area topography & DTM);
- 2) Detailed hydrologic analysis of the Salmon Creek watershed (includes a HEC-HMS model, and hydrographs of project design storms);
- 3) Assessment of existing tidegate performance using a spreadsheet hydrologic routing model (includes a spreadsheet model created specifically for this project & a preliminary performance assessment of the existing tidegate structures for fish passage & flood routing);
- 4) Preliminary analysis of various tidegate alternatives. The various alternatives were analyzed for improving fish access and flood routing through the tidegate structures;
- 5) Detailed hydraulic modeling of the proposed tidegate structures. A detailed 1-dimensional hydraulic model was developed of the project area, used to conduct unsteady analysis. This model was/will be used to conduct detailed hydraulic analysis of pre-project and post-project conditions, providing information on the improved fish passage, tidal wetland/estuary flow conditions and flood routing.

The “Subgrade Soil Bearing Capacity at Tide Gate Sites” report (prepared by Laco Associates) and the “Draft Environmental Assessment for the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge (HBNWR) Salmon Creek Restoration” (prepared by Eric Nelson of HBNWR) were submitted with Progress Report #5. Portions of the project were constructed in January 2007, including the installation of a 5-foot x 8-foot tidegate and a new 4-foot diameter tidegate. The Environmental Assessment for the Salmon Creek Restoration project was also submitted with Progress Report #5. A report on a portion of the constructed project is included on the submitted Final Report CD.

Yontocket Slough Fish Passage and Habitat Enhancement Project

This project is located in Del Norte County and is part of the Smith River estuary, located north of Crescent City. The existing fish access and habitat conditions within Yontocket Slough were identified by CDFG and other entities as a limiting factor for anadromous salmonids. Historically, the slough was a large open expanse of deep water, supporting thriving populations of trout and coho salmon. During the 1964 flood, and other events, the slough filled with fine sediments, making it much shallower. The introduction of the semi-aquatic canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) to the area in the 1960's has lead to colonization of the

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

slough by this invasive species. It prohibits growth of native riparian vegetation and results in decreased channel capacity, making the slough impassable for various fish species, while additionally limiting the availability of quality rearing habitat. Two culverts on Pala Road, managed by California State Parks, have also limited access of anadromous salmonids to this important habitat for over 20 years. The culverts have created a large depositional reach of fine sediments and have disconnected the slough from the Smith River estuarine tidal influence. The design element funded under this grant agreement was completion of the sediment coring and analysis of deposited sediments within Yontocket Slough. The drilling/coring identified the level of sediment aggradation from flood events, along with the strata associated with pre-1880's tribal cultural deposits (Yontocket was the site of a large Native American village). This information has given the agencies involved in the project (CDFG & State Parks) a starting point for completing final design and permitting for construction. 5C staff developed a contract with Michael Love & Associates, the prime consultant responsible for completing and submitting required permit applications and obtaining archeological clearance as required, for the project. Love contracted with Pacific Watershed Associates (PWA) to perform the coring fieldwork in October 2005 and coordinated with the Smith River Rancheria to provide tribal cultural monitors during the coring. The stratigraphic investigation report findings were incorporated into three alternatives for improving aquatic habitat and fish passage in the slough. Currently, State Parks and CDFG are negotiating a potential land swap for this project. State Parks is also interested in a fourth alternative that involves large-scale excavation, with excavation depths based on the sediment coring results from PWA. The coring report, funded under this grant agreement, is included on the submitted Final Report CD, as is a Final Report on the design of the project (funded by matching grant sources).



Yontocket Slough

Reed canary grass in the Slough

Smith River inundation

North Fork and South Fork Ryan Creek Migration Barrier Removal Projects

These crossings are located on State Highway 101, approximately 6 miles north of Willits in Mendocino County. Ryan Creek supports steelhead, Chinook and coho salmon and is a tributary to Outlet Creek, a high priority watershed listed in the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon* (2004) as it has one of the longest migrating populations of coho salmon within California. These projects are within the Northern California Steelhead, California Coastal Chinook, and Southern

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Oregon-Northern California coho ESUs. These two projects, along with the private driveway crossing on South Fork Ryan, were designed together due to their proximity and realized cost savings of completing design, securing permits, and potential construction under one contract. In an effort to effectively and efficiently restore habitat in this important sub-watershed, 5C staff has continuously worked with Caltrans staff and the selected design consultant, Prunuske Chatham, Inc. on design and permitting issues for these three crossings simultaneously. The North Fork (NF) crossing was identified in the Caltrans District 1 fish passage inventory as the second highest priority to treat and was included in the *Inventory of barriers to fish passage in California's Coastal Watersheds*. The existing crossing at the NF site is a concrete lined 5-foot diameter, 83-foot long corrugated metal pipe with a 3-foot outlet jump, the primary barrier. The final design consists of full replacement with a 21-foot diameter embedded arch culvert to create a natural bottom. This design utilizes the "Stream Simulation" approach, which sizes the replacement structure at 1.5 times the active channel width. The new culvert will also convey the 100-year flows, estimated at 665 cfs. The South Fork (SF) Ryan Creek crossing is located approximately ¼ mile south of the NF site and was identified as the 6th highest priority in District 1. The existing structure is a 5-foot diameter, 125-foot long corrugated metal pipe with a concrete apron invert. The design plan at this crossing is to install angled metal baffles and an emergency overflow culvert on the right inlet hinge to compensate for the lost hydraulic capacity of the main culvert. Installation of baffles will eliminate the velocity barrier and provide adequate resting pools for adults and juveniles.

The private driveway crossing was identified as a barrier during the September 2006 site visit (see below) and SCC staff authorized the Consultant to work on design plans for improving passage at this site. Jon Mann (Prunuske Chatham, Inc.) initiated design by contacting the private landowner to discuss the barrier and the landowner is agreeable to a replacement option. The two driveway culverts were installed in late 1970 and are both barriers. The crossing consists of two 5-foot diameter corrugated metal pipes under a 25-foot embankment. One culvert is 40% crushed in the middle and the other is starting to rust through on the bottom. The northern pipe is 102-feet long, set slightly lower in elevation than the southern pipe so that it catches the first streamflows and is perched approximately 1.5 feet. The driveway slope is approximately 20%. The proposed design is to replace the existing corrugated metal pipes with another crossing structure, the most appropriate being a much larger culvert (replacement with a bridge may be difficult due to the steep driveway grade). A standard structural metal plate pipe arch similar to the proposed design for the NF site can be considered. This conceptual design will require a geotechnical investigation to determine depths to bedrock within the replacement culverts.

There are eight landowners within the limits of these three projects, including Caltrans right-of-way and all existing landowners support the projects. Design elements funded under this grant program included the following with in-kind from Caltrans where noted:

- 1) Assemblage of a Technical Advisory Team (TAT) including Marcin Whitman & Scott Harris (CDFG), Tom Daugherty & Rick Wantuck (NMFS biologist &

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

engineer), Lucy Kostrzewa & Tim Ash (Caltrans hydrology & environmental), and later Jon Mann (P Chatham);

2) Formulation of the design criteria for all three crossings (TAT);

3) Three site visits & numerous conference calls:

SITE VISITS

- July 2005 Initial Site Visit with Kostrzewa & Ash, Harris, Jordan & Lancaster;

- July 2006 Fisheries Assessment with Jordan & Ross Taylor (5C fisheries biologist);

- September 2006 Site Visit with Consultant: Kostrzewa, Ash, & Susan Leroy (Caltrans), Mann, Dennis Ruttenberg & Jennifer Michaud (P Chatham), Michael Bowen (SCC), Alex Straessle (Mendocino County DOT), Harris, Daugherty & Jordan.

4) Initial site surveying (Caltrans in-kind);

5) Hydraulic analysis of the watershed for 100-year flood flows (Caltrans in kind: Lisa Hockaday & Kostrzewa);

6) Geotechnical Analysis (Caltrans in-kind: Drill Crew, Charlie Narwold);

7) FishXing analysis of the SF culverts, Final Surveying (including the private driveway crossing); Environmental Resources & Permitting Information Review; Civil & Structural engineering; draft & final design plans & specifications (Prunuske Chatham, Inc.);

8) 5C staff conducted formulation of design criteria with various resource agency personnel & Caltrans staff; RFP preparation & ranking criteria/selection of design team; Contract development & management; Encroachment permit applications for design of both sites (Caltrans waived application fees); Landowner contacts & right-of-entry agreements; Information gathering & data transfer between the TAT.

CDFG staff and the District 1 inventory estimated approximately 15,000 feet or miles of good quality habitat upstream of the SF and NF highway crossings with no other known barriers upstream. Once all of the barriers in this portion of the watershed are treated (including the County road crossing of Ryan Creek, 3 miles of habitat will be made accessible to coho and Chinook salmon and steelhead. Pacific lamprey have also been sighted in the outlet pool of the County crossing. The final design plans/technical specifications (Caltrans format), the biological resource data for permitting of all three projects, and cost estimates are included on the submitted Final Report CD. Caltrans will be required to review the designs for the two highway projects prior to completing the permitting process. It is anticipated that the 5C Program will work with a consultant to secure funding and finalize permitting for both the South Fork highway and private driveway crossing projects. Caltrans will be responsible, either until completed or until another agency/entity assumes responsibility, for finalizing the permitting and completing construction of the North Fork crossing, although they have no immediate plans to do so. Design plans are included in Attachment 9 and also on the submitted Final Report CD.

Fish Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

This project is located on State Highway 254 in Humboldt County, within Humboldt Redwoods State Park. There is 1.63 miles of good quality upstream habitat above the existing 6-foot wide, 184-foot long concrete, single-bay, box culvert. It was identified as the highest priority crossing to treat for fish passage as a result of the Caltrans District 1 Assessment. The outlet has a 9-foot wide, 45-foot long concrete apron and the culvert is retrofit with eight concrete ramp-style baffles. Fish Creek is a major tributary to the South Fork Eel River (confluence ~320 feet downstream of the crossing) and the culvert is the only barrier in the system. Steelhead, Chinook, and coho salmon have been located in the outlet pool during past CDFG spawning surveys. In 2000, the Caltrans' Office of Design South compiled a list of ten projects on State Highway 254 that included: replacement of damaged culverts, down drains, and drainage inlets. A quick treatment for resurfacing the Fish Creek culvert's invert (presently consisting of broken concrete and exposed rebar) was developed. Environmental evaluations and preliminary drainage reports were compiled for this and the other nine projects, but they were never implemented due to a Caltrans budget constraint. The preliminary report recommended replacing the existing box culvert with a "two bay" nine-foot wide by eight-foot high concrete box culvert. This replacement option would likely require baffles to address fish passage at this site, unless installed at a less steep grade than the existing structure. The project was added to this grant agreement's Work Program in June 2005 but was removed in June 2006 due to time constraints and lack of in-kind sources from Caltrans. Portions of the project's design that were completed include a draft MOU/Cooperative (COOP) Agreement between Caltrans and Trinity County for the design services and a draft bridge design. The COOP agreement was not finalized, but a draft agreement is on file with the 5C Program. A site visit with Kostrzewa, Ash, Lancaster, Jordan, Gary Flosi and Paul Divine (CDFG) was held in July 2005 to discuss the potential design options. Caltrans engineer Darron Hill also developed a conceptual design for constructing a 25-foot long bridge but the removal of two 6-foot diameter redwood trees would be required. The crossing is located within Humboldt Redwoods State Park and full collaboration between Caltrans and State Parks has not been addressed to date, with the exception of several conference calls between Ash, Kostrzewa, Hill, Jordan and Keith Witte (Park environmental staff). Since the bridge design would result in the removal of the two redwood trees, Witte expressed interest in investigating all potential designs that would not impact the trees or their root systems. Jordan developed a Request for Proposal for design of an alternative crossing structure in and one response was received. The cost of designing alternatives to the bridge design (including topographical surveying, geotechnical work, hydrology, civil and structural design, and final plans and specifications) far exceeded the available funds remaining in the grant agreement and in-kind for these services from Caltrans was not feasible in May 2006. Discussion with Caltrans staff and the Coastal Conservancy grant manager resulted in the removal of this project from the Work Program, but it is still a high priority project. Every effort should be made to ensure that this project is designed, and constructed, within the next ten years.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

BUDGET

This grant agreement was for \$670,178 to be utilized in the design and permitting of twenty-six fish passage improvement projects. The funding for each task outlined above was as follows:

Task 1 – Grant Administration – \$71,000

Task 2 – Technical Advisory Team – \$9,418

Task 3 – Fish Passage Design and Engineering Workshop – \$22,710

Task 4 – Migration Barrier Removal Project Planning – \$567,050

(In-kind funding for projects is highlighted in Attachment 1)

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Project List with Breakdown of Matching & SCC Funding

Attachment 2 – Map of Project Location Sites

Attachment 3 – Indian Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project plans

Attachment 4 – Ryan Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project plans

Attachment 5 – Conner Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project design report

Attachment 6 – Little Browns Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project plans

Attachment 7 - North Fork Schooner Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project design report

Attachment 8 – South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project - James L. Hamman Driveway Crossing plans

Attachment 9 - North Fork and South Fork Ryan Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Plans

FINAL REPORT CD

Includes this Final Report, electronic format of all attached Plans and those submitted with previous Progress Reports, final reports of projects already constructed, and design information for select projects:

- Griffin Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project Plans
- Yonkers Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Final Report

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

- Graham Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project Final Report
- Indian Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Plans
- Rocky Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project Design Report
- Albion River & Marsh Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Plans & Final Report
- Ryan Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Plans
- Conner Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project Conceptual Design Report
- Deadwood Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Final Report
- Little Browns Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Plans & Other Documents
- Soldier Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Final Report
- North Fork Schooner Gulch Migration Barrier Removal Project Plans
- South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project - James L. Hamman Driveway Crossing Plans & Design Reports
- Caspar Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project Plans & Other Documents
- Salmon Creek Tidegates Fish Passage Improvement Project Final Report
- Yontocket Slough Fish Passage and Habitat Enhancement Project Reports
- North Fork and South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project Plans & Design Reports
- Fish Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project - Caltrans Preliminary Bridge Design Plans

Also included on the CD is the 2006 Fish Passage Design & Engineering Workshop Final Report for videography (taping and production funded by the NOAA Restoration Center, California Department of Fish and Game, Pacific State Marine Fisheries Commission, and the Coastal Conservancy).

A copy of the 2006 Fish Passage Design & Engineering Workshop Training DVD Set is also included as this was completed with funding under Task 3.

Attachment One

Project List with Breakdown of Matching & Coastal
Conservancy Funding

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Project	Design Element Entity	County Matching Funds	Other Matching Funds Source	Other Matching Funds	03-051 Design	Total Design Cost	03-051 Percentage
COUNTY PROJECTS							
Griffin Creek Fish Passage Improvement	Del Norte County Road Department	\$5,000		\$0	\$15,476	\$20,476	76%
Yonkers Creek Migration Barrier Removal	Del Norte County Road Department City of Crescent City	\$16,154		\$0	\$17,000	\$33,154	51%
Graham Gulch Migration Barrier Removal	Humboldt County DPW	\$12,446	CDFG FRGP	\$34,083	\$5,447	\$51,976	10%
Indian Creek Migration Barrier Removal	Humboldt County DPW	\$10,000		\$0	\$27,000	\$37,000	73%
Painter Creek Migration Barrier Removal	Humboldt County DPW	\$5,000		\$0	\$12,000	\$17,000	71%
Rocky Gulch Migration Barrier Removal	Humboldt County DPW	\$10,000	CDFG FRGP	\$11,000	\$25,122	\$46,122	54%
Albion River & Marsh Creek Migration Barrier Removal	Mendocino County DOT	\$25,493		\$0	\$55,362	\$80,855	68%
Ancestor Creek Migration Barrier Removal	Mendocino County DOT	\$7,000	CDFG FRGP	\$5,000	\$14,443	\$26,443	55%
Dark Gulch Migration Barrier Removal	Mendocino County DOT	\$3,703	CDFG FRGP	\$13,773	\$5,127	\$22,603	23%
Ryan Creek Migration Barrier Removal	Mendocino County DOT	\$30,099	CDFG FRGP	\$2,346	\$13,242	\$45,687	29%
Conner Creek #1 & #2 Fish Passage Improvement	Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program		CDFG FRGP	\$3,900	\$27,950	\$31,850	88%
Deadwood Creek Fish Passage Improvement	Trinity County DOT Trinity County RCD	\$1,504	CDFG FRGP NFWF	\$2,202 \$7,010	\$8,084	\$18,800	43%
Little Browns Creek Migration Barrier Removal	Trinity County DOT	\$5,970	CDFG FRGP	\$15,822	\$35,732	\$57,525	62%
Soldier Creek #1 & #2 Migration Barrier Removal	Trinity County DOT	\$22,557	*CDFG FRGP *NOAA American Rivers *NFWF	\$8,264 \$25,000 \$10,000	\$16,740	\$82,561	20%

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Project	Design Element Entity	County Matching Funds	Other Matching Funds Source	Other Matching Funds	03-051 Design	Total Design Cost	03-051 Percentage
PRIVATE ROAD PROJECTS							
North Fork Schooner Gulch Migration Barrier Removal	Mendocino County RCD		Natural Resources Conservation Service	\$5,650	\$24,710	\$30,360	81%
South Fork Ryan Creek – Hamman Driveway Crossing	State Coastal Conservancy				\$22,246	\$22,246	100%
FEDERAL and STATE OWNERSHIP PROJECTS							
North & South Fork Caspar Creek Fish Passage Improvement	CDF USFS Redwood Sciences Lab		NOAA's NMFS CDF	\$2,800 \$1,800	\$124,539	\$129,139	96%
Fish Creek Migration Barrier Removal	Caltrans & Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program		Caltrans	\$2,580	\$978	\$3,558	27%
North Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement	Caltrans & Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program		Caltrans	\$35,011	\$44,493	\$79,504	56%
South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement	Caltrans & Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program		Caltrans	\$1,500	\$22,246	\$23,746	94%
Salmon Creek Tidegates Fish Passage & Habitat Improvement	Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife & Wetlands Restoration Association		USFWS Coastal Program	\$30,000	\$29,991	\$59,991	50%
Yontocket Slough Fish Passage & Habitat Enhancement	Michael Love & Associates		CDFG FRGP Smith River Alliance	\$34,899 \$11,383	\$17,102	\$63,384	27%
		\$154,926		\$264,023	\$565,028	\$983,977	57%

CDF - California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
 CDFG FRGP - California Department of Fish and Game Fisheries Restoration Grant Program
 NFWF - National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
 NOAA's NMFS - NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
 USFS - United States Forest Service
 USFWS - United States Fish and Wildlife Service


Attachment Two
Map of Project Location Sites

Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Coastal Conservancy Grant No. 03051

Fish Passage Improvement Project Locations within Coho Salmon ESUs



Attachment 3

Indian Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Plans




FUNDING SOURCE
THIS PROJECT IS FUNDED BY DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND GAME, COASTAL SALMON RECOVERY
PROJECT FUNDS.

APPLICABLE STANDARD PLANS	
A10A	ABBREVIATIONS
A10B	SYMBOLS
A62A	EXCAVATION AND BACKFILL MISCELLANEOUS DETAILS
A74	SURVEY MONUMENTS
A77A-C	METAL BEAM GUARD RAILING
A77D-F	GUARD RAIL FLARES
A77H1-3	METAL BEAM GUARD RAILING END TREATMENT TERMINAL ANCHOR ASSEMBLY (TYPE SFT)
A77L1	METAL BEAM GUARD RAILING AND SINGLE FACED BARRIER RAILING TERMINAL SYSTEM END TREATMENT
BO-1	BRIDGE DETAILS
BO-3	BRIDGE DETAILS

INDEX OF SHEETS	
1	COVER SHEET, LOCATION MAP AND VICINITY MAP
2	CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGNS, QUANTITIES, SURVEY CONTROL, AND DETAILS
3	"L" LINE PLAN & PROFILE STA 10+75 TO STA 13+50 MATTOLE ROAD
4	BRIDGE - GENERAL PLAN
5	ABUTMENT, WINGWALL AND FOOTING DETAILS
6	PLAN VIEW - ABUTMENTS, WINGWALL & PILES
7	BRIDGE SLAB REINFORCEMENT & DETAILS
8	FOUNDATION PLAN AND DECK CONTOURS
9	TYPE 117 BRIDGE RAILING
10	DETOUR - PLAN AND PROFILE STA 0+00 TO STA 3+02.86
11	DETOUR DETAILS, EROSION CONTROL AND WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
12	LOG OF TEST BORINGS

COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE OVER INDIAN CREEK ON MATTOLE ROAD (F3C010) AT PM 10.0 AGREEMENT NO. P0310511 CONTRACT NO. 204301



PREPARED BY
STRUCTURAL PLANS ON SHEETS 4 THRU 8
ARE PREPARED BY:
MORRISON STRUCTURES, INC.
1050 WEST STREET
REDDING, CA 96001
TEL (530) 246-8628
FAX (530) 246-8625

RECOMMENDED

APPROVED

CHRISTOPHER J. WHITWORTH
RCE 51931, EXP. 6/30/2006

DATE

Christopher J. Whitworth




DATE

Robert L. Burnett

ROBERT L. BURNETT
RCE 36210, EXP. 06/30/2006

LOCATION MAP
SCALE: 1"=10.0 MILE



ROAD NAME: MATTOLE ROAD		ROAD NO. F3C010	MILE POST: 10.0	DESIGN SECTION R. L. BURNETT
CONTRACT NO. 204301		DESIGNED BY: JAB/LLH		
DRAWING FILE NAME: L:\PROJECTS\204301\DWG\CONSOL.DWG		REVIEWED BY: RLB		APPROVED BY: CJW
PLOT DATE: 07/25/2005		COVER SHEET AND SHEET INDEX		
INDIAN CREEK BRIDGE - MATTOLE ROAD				
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS				
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT				
SHEET 1 OF 12				

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

SIGN TYPE	QTY	DESCRIPTION	SIZE	REMARKS	POST SIZE	NUMBER
C18	2	ROAD CONSTRUCTION AHEAD	48" x 48"	VISIBLE AT ALL TIMES	4" x 4"	1
C16	2	ONE LANE ROAD AHEAD	48" x 48"	VISIBLE AT ALL TIMES	4" x 4"	1
W17 & C29-500	2	STOP AHEAD 500 FT	48" x 48"	VISIBLE AT ALL TIMES	4" x 4"	1
R1 & R-SPECIAL	2	STOP PROCEED WHEN CLEAR	48" x 48"	VISIBLE AT ALL TIMES	4" x 4"	1
C13	2	END CONSTRUCTION	60" x 24"	VISIBLE AT ALL TIMES	4" x 4"	2

CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGN SUMMARY

SURVEY BY OSCAR LARSON & ASSOCIATES - AUGUST 2004.
VERTICAL DATUM: ASSUMED EL=100FT AT TOP CONC APRON, CL
CULVERT OUTLET.
HORIZONTAL DATUM: NORTH AMERICAN DATUM OF 1983 (NAD83)
BASED ON GPS TIES TO REFERENCE STATION CME1, PID A7894.
DISTANCE SHOWN ARE GRID DISTANCES WITH A COMBINED SCALE
FACTOR OF 0.999993765.

PNT.#	NORTHING	EASTING	DESCRIPTION
100	1994792.763	5933776.217	CPREBAR
101	1995429.208	5933382.921	CPREBAR
200	1995093.547	5933716.109	CPSPK
201	1994792.763	5933776.217	CPRBR
305	1995429.238	5933382.905	GPS101
310	1995214.395	5933575.717	TOP2.SINPIPE
311	1995187.696	5933607.488	TOP2.SINPIPE
381	1995216.250	5933583.692	CP60D
382	1995189.670	5933648.862	CP60D
438	1995196.120	5933526.234	CP60D
495	1995247.601	5933430.947	CP60D
558	1995216.238	5933583.676	CK381
560	1995200.510	5933688.588	CPX
561	1995236.416	5933808.184	CP60D
672	1995200.516	5933688.587	CK560

SURVEY CONTROL COORDINATES

ITEM	ITEM DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY
1	Construct Detour - Mattole Rd	LS	1
2	Construction Area Signs	EA	10
3	Type III Barricade	EA	6
4	Remove Culvert	LS	1
5	Clearing and Grubbing	LS	1
6	Roadway Excavation	CY	1,525
7	Structure Excavation (Bridge)	CY	245
8	Structure Backfill (Bridge)	CY	285
9	Erosion Control (Type D)	LS	245
10	Class 3 Aggregate Base	CY	245
11	Asphalt Concrete (Type A)	Ton	205
12	Furnish Steel Piling (HP 10 x 57)	LF	354
13	Drive Steel Piling	EA	18
14	Structural Concrete, Bridge Footing	CY	31
15	Structural Concrete, Bridge	CY	225
16	S-F Bar Reinforcing Steel	Lbs	45,000
17	Rock Slope Protection (12 ton, Method B)	CY	240
18	Metal Beam Guard Railing	LF	113
19	Metal Tube Bridge Railing (Type 117)	LF	160
20	Terminal Section (Type C)	EA	2
21	End Section	EA	4
22	Terminal System (Type SRT)	EA	2
23	Terminal Anchor Assembly (Type SFT)	EA	2
24	Mobilization	LS	1

QUANTITIES

PNT.#	NORTHING	EASTING	DESCRIPTION
5004	1,995,083.117	5,933,703.357	"L"10+75 Begin
5063	1,994,793.210	5,933,195.245	RP
5079	1,995,178.463	5,933,635.477	"L"11+92.24 BB
5080	1,995,211.942	5,933,603.764	"L"12+38.56 EB
5014	1,995,265.824	5,933,540.007	"L"13+21.91 EC
5016	1,995,282.378	5,933,517.313	"L"13+50 End
5004	1,995,083.117	5,933,703.357	"D"0+00
5017	1,995,064.252	5,933,713.667	RP
5064	1,995,017.920	5,933,625.048	RP
5020	1,995,102.357	5,933,678.623	"D"0+52.37 PT
5023	1,995,126.218	5,933,641.018	RP
5065	1,995,210.655	5,933,694.593	RP
5026	1,995,150.357	5,933,614.817	"D"1+32.72 PT
5036	1,995,286.088	5,933,512.227	"D"3+02.86 End

"D-LINE" SURVEY COORDINATES

PNT.#	NORTHING	EASTING	DESCRIPTION
5004	1,995,083.117	5,933,703.357	"L"10+75 Begin
5063	1,994,793.210	5,933,195.245	RP
5079	1,995,178.463	5,933,635.477	"L"11+92.24 BB
5080	1,995,211.942	5,933,603.764	"L"12+38.56 EB
5014	1,995,265.824	5,933,540.007	"L"13+21.91 EC
5016	1,995,282.378	5,933,517.313	"L"13+50 End


"L-LINE" SURVEY COORDINATES

BAR IS ONE INCH ON ORIGINAL DRAWING		IF NOT ONE INCH ON THIS SHEET, ADJUST SCALES ACCORDINGLY	
ROAD NAME: MATTOLE ROAD		PROJECT NO: 204301	
ROAD NO: F30010		CONTRACT NO: 204301	
MILE POST: 10.0		DRAWING FILE NAME: L:\PROJECTS\2004301\DWG\CDSN02.DWG	
DESIGNED BY: LTR/RLM		APPROVED BY: C.M.	


CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGNS, QUANTITIES, SURVEY CONTROL AND DETAILS



- 1) SIGNS SHALL BE PLACED AS SHOWN ON PLAN OR AS DIRECTED BY THE RESIDENT ENGINEER.
- 2) FINAL PLACEMENT OF SIGNS SHALL BE APPROVED BY RESIDENT ENGINEER.
- 3) ADDITIONAL PORTABLE SIGNS SHALL BE USED AS REQUIRED FOR OTHER ROADSIDE WORK.
- 4) SEE STANDARD PLAN T13 FOR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM.
- 5) IN ADDITION TO CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGNS AND WHEN DIRECTED BY THE RESIDENT ENGINEER, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL UTILIZE FLAGMEN AS NECESSARY TO DIRECT TRAFFIC.
- 6) DISTANCE TO C18/C23 AND C13/C14 MAY BE EXTENDED TO ENCOMPASS SITES WITHIN ONE MILE OF EACH OTHER.

NOTES



RURAL CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGN





SHEET 3 OF 12	COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS		DESIGN SECTION	ROAD NAME: MATTOLE ROAD	BAR IS ONE INCH ON ORIGINAL DRAWING
	INDIAN CREEK BRIDGE - MATTOLE ROAD		DESIGNED BY: JLB/RLM	DRAWN NO: F30010	IF NOT ONE INCH ON THIS SHEET, ADJUST SCALES ACCORDINGLY
	STA 10+75 TO 13+50		DRAWN BY: JMB/LH	CONTRACT NO.: 204301	
	L' LINE PLAN AND PROFILE		APPROVED BY: C.M.	DRAWING FILE NAME: L:\PROJECTS\204301\DWG\CDSD01.DWG	
			REVIEWED BY: RLB	PLT DATE: 07/25/2005	







The accuracy of solid information is not warranted by Morrison Structures, Inc. or the County and interested or affected parties should make their own investigation. Flood plain data is based upon information available when the plans were prepared and are shown to meet federal requirements.

HYDROLOGIC SUMMARY				
DRAINAGE AREA: 2.42 SQ MILES				
DESIGN BASE FLOOD OVERTOPPING	100	1123	105.5	115.5
DISCHARGE (C.F.S.)	100	1123	105.5	115.5
WATER SURFACE (ELEV. AT BRIDGE)	105.5	105.5	105.5	115.5

PILE DATA - STEEL PILES				
LOCATION	DESIGN LOADING	TYPE	SPECIFIED TIP ELEV.	PROBABLE TIP ELEV.
WEST ABUT	45 TON	HP10X57	80.0	78.0
EAST ABUT	45 TON	HP10X57	80.0	78.0

DESIGN: BRIDGE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS - 1996 AASHTO WITH INTERIMS AND REVISIONS BY CALTRANS SUPPLEMENTS
DEAD LOAD: INCLUDES 35 P.S.F. FOR FUTURE WEARING SURFACE
LIVE LOAD: HS20-44 AND ALTERNATIVE AND PERMIT DESIGN LOAD
REINFORCEMENT: $f_y = 60,000$ P.S.I. (REINFORCING STEEL)
CONCRETE: $f_c = 3,250$ P.S.I., $n=9$
PILES: DESIGN LOADING = 45 TON
CONSTRUCTION: STATE OF CALIFORNIA STANDARD SPECS., DATED JULY, 2002 AND THE PROJECT SPECIAL PROVISIONS.
SEISMIC LOADING: PEAK ROCK ACCELERATION 0.7g
SOIL PROFILE: TYPE D

DESIGN NOTES, LOAD FACTOR DESIGN






SHEET 4 OF 12	COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS		DESIGN SECTION	R. L. BURNETT
	INDIAN CREEK BRIDGE - MATTOLE ROAD		DRAWN BY: JAB/LLH	APPROVED BY: C.M.
	BRIDGE - GENERAL PLAN		CONTRACT NO.: 204301	REVIEWED BY: RLB
			DRAWING FILE NAME: I:\PROJECTS\204301\DWG\CSNO4.DWG	PLANT DATE: 07/25/2005






NOTES:
1. PLACE BACKFILL BEHIND BOTH ABUTMENTS SIMULTANEOUSLY AFTER DECK HAS BEEN PLACED.

KEY DETAIL
SCALE: 1"=1'




WINGWALL SECTION J-J
SCALE: 1"=1'




SHEET 5 OF 12	COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS		DESIGN SECTION	R. L. BURNETT	ROAD NO. F30010	MILE POST: 10.0	ROAD NAME: MATTOLE ROAD
	INDIAN CREEK BRIDGE - MATTOLE ROAD		DRAWN BY: JAB/LH	DESIGNED BY: JAB/LH	CONTRACT NO. 204301	APPROVED BY: C.M.	PLAT DATE: 01/25/2005
ABUTMENT, WINGWALL, AND FOOTING DETAILS		REVIEWED BY: RLB		L:\PROJECTS\204301\DWG\CONSTR.DWG		DRAWING FILE NAME:	
						IF NOT ONE INCH ON THIS SHEET, ADJUST SCALES ACCORDINGLY	




PLAN VIEW - ABUTMENTS
SCALE: 1" = 5'



CONCRETE TYPE LIMITS
NO SCALE





TYPICAL SECTION R.S.P.
NO SCALE



NOTE: DOES NOT INCLUDE ALLOWANCES FOR FALSEWORK SETTLEMENT


CAMBER DIAGRAM
NO SCALE






NOTE:
SPACING OF ALL TRANSVERSE BARS IS MEASURED
ALONG C OF ROADWAY. PLACE ALL TRANSVERSE BARS
PARALLEL TO ABUTMENTS.

TRANSVERSE REINFORCEMENT
NOT TO SCALE




EDGE OF SLAB DETAIL
NOT TO SCALE


NOTE:
SEE RAIL DETAILS FOR ADDITIONAL
REINFORCEMENT AND ANCHOR BOLTS



REINFORCEMENT BOT. OF SLAB
SCALE 1" = 5'























REINFORCEMENT TOP OF SLAB
SCALE 1" = 5'





SHEET 7 OF 12	COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS		DESIGN SECTION	ROAD NAME: MATTOLE ROAD	WILE POST: 100	AGREEMENT NO. P0310511	CONTRACT NO. 204301	DRAWING FILE NAME: L:\PROJECTS\204301\DWG\CONSTR.DWG	APPROVED BY: C.M.
	INDIAN CREEK BRIDGE - MATTOLE ROAD		DESIGNED BY: L.H./R.M.	REVIEWED BY: R.B.					
	BRIDGE SLAB REINFORCEMENT AND DETAILS								


- NOTES:
1. Posts shall be vertical.
 2. Tubing shall be shop bent to fit horizontal curve when curve radius is less than 950.
 3. Tubing shall be continuous over not less than 3 intermediate posts, with a minimum length of 3 panels except as noted.
 4. No more than one tube splice per panel is permitted, except as noted.
 5. Space posts to provide 1'-6" min. clear between rail joints in top and bottom tubes at deck expansion joints and CL of post.
 6. Rail joints shall provide allowance for movement equal to width of deck joint with corresponding increase in length of sleeve.
 7. Railing on bridge wingwalls to be placed after walls are backfilled.
 8. 3/4" stud bolt nuts shall be torqued to 175 ft. lbs. Anchor bolt nuts shall be wrench tight.
 9. Galvanized rail assembly after fabrication.
 10. Designed by AASHTO dated 1973 and Interim Specifications dated 1974, 1975, and 1976.
 11. Design height of rail is based on a future overlay of 3 inches maximum.



ROAD NAME: MATTOLE ROAD	FILE POST: 100	DESIGN SECTION: R. L. BURNETT
CONTRACT NO.: 204301	DESIGNED BY: LTH/RLM	DRAWN BY: JAB/LH
AGREEMENT NO.: P030511	REVIEWED BY: RLB	APPROVED BY: CWM
DRAWING FILE NAME: L:\PROJECTS\203303\DWG\CDSD03.DWG	SCALE: AS SHOWN	DATE: 07/25/2005
PLT DATE: 07/25/2005	SCALE: AS SHOWN	DATE: 07/25/2005




SHEET 10 OF 12	COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS		DESIGN SECTION	ROAD NAME: MATTOLE ROAD ROAD NO: F3010 MILE POST: 10.0	DESIGNED BY: LTH/RLM DRAWN BY: JAB/LTH REVIEWED BY: RLH APPROVED BY: CMW	PLT DATE: 07/25/2005 DRAWING FILE NAME: L:\PROJECTS\204301\DWG\CDR\10.DWG CONTRACT NO. 204301 AGREEMENT NO. P0310511 ROAD NO: F3010 MILE POST: 10.0	INDIAN CREEK BRIDGE - MATTOLE ROAD DETOUR PLAN AND PROFILE STA 0+00 TO 3+02.86



Attachment 4

Ryan Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project Plans



SCALE 1" = 25'




MENDOCINO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DRAINAGE AND HABITAT CONSERVATION DIVISION OF LAND IMPROVEMENT
340 LAKE MENDOCINO DRIVE UKIAH, CA 95482 (707) 463-4363 FAX (707) 463-5474

RYAN CREEK FISH BARRIER REMOVAL 2007
CR-310C-MP-0.17-1, WILLITS, CA.
RYAN CREEK

PLAN VIEW

DESIGNED BY H.N.A.	DRAWN BY J.M.S.	DATE XX-XX-01	DATE XX-XX-01
HOWARD N. DASHIELL H.N.A.	HOWARD N. DASHIELL RCE 42001	HOWARD N. DASHIELL RCE 42001	HOWARD N. DASHIELL DIRECTOR

DATE	03-16-2008
JOB NO.	D-0202
DRAWING NUMBER	1 OF 3




DIMENSIONS GIVEN ARE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY FROM (BEBE TYPE E20/4
PRECAST CONCRETE ARCH ELEMENT)

Ryan Creek

Mendocino County

CA

Upstream



ISOMETRIC VIEW

Downstream

NOTICE
© 2006, The design and information shown on this drawing is provided as a service to the project owner, engineer and contractor by CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. No part of this drawing may be used, reproduced or modified in any manner without the express written permission of CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. makes no warranty, representation or modification of this drawing is done at the user's own risk and the user agrees to indemnify, defend and hold harmless CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. from and against any and all claims, liability and expense, including, but not limited to, reasonable attorney's fees arising from such use, reproduction or modification.
If discrepancies between the supplied information and actual field conditions are encountered as site work progresses, these discrepancies must be reported to CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc., immediately for re-evaluation of the design. CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. accepts no liability for designs based on inaccurate information supplied by others.
The CONSPAN® Bridge System is protected by one or more patents, patent pending and Trademarks.

Preliminary Drawings
prepared for:
Jason
Leach



3100 Research Blvd, P.O. Box 20266 Dayton, Ohio 45420-0266
Phone: (603) 526-3999 Fax: 937-264-8365
www.con-span.com

Mendocino County


CA

Ryan Creek

Date:
02/13/07


DYOB No.
115114

Sheet No.
1



NOTICE
© 2006. The design and information shown on this drawing is provided as a service to the project owner, engineer and contractor by CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. No part of this drawing may be used, reproduced or modified in any manner without the written consent of CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of this drawing. CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. does not accept any liability for damages, including but not limited to, reasonable attorney's fees arising from such use, reproduction or modification.
If discrepancies between the supplied information and actual field conditions are encountered as site work progresses, these discrepancies must be reported to CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc., immediately for re-evaluation of the design. CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. accepts no liability for designs based on inaccurate information supplied by others.
The CONSPAN® Bridge System is protected by one or more patents, patent pending and Trademarks.

Preliminary Drawings
prepared for:
Jason
Leach



CONSPAN®
BRIDGE SYSTEMS

3100 Research Blvd, P.O. Box 20286 Dayton, Ohio 45420-0286
Phone: (603) 526-3999 Fax: 937-254-8365
www.con-span.com

CA


Mendocino County

Ryan Creek


Date: 02/13/07

DYOB No. 115114

Sheet No. **2**



DOWNSTREAM END ELEVATION




UPSTREAM END ELEVATION

NOTICE: The design and information shown on this drawing is provided as a service to the project owner, engineer and contractor by CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. No part of this drawing may be used, reproduced or modified in any manner without the written consent of CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. The user agrees to indemnify, defend and hold harmless CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. from and against any and all claims, liability and expense, including, but not limited to, reasonable attorney's fees arising from such use, reproduction or modification.

If discrepancies between the supplied information and actual field conditions are encountered as site work progresses, these discrepancies must be reported to CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc., immediately for re-evaluation of the design. CONTECH Arch Technologies, Inc. accepts no liability for designs based on inaccurate information supplied by others.

The CONSPAN® Bridge System is protected by one or more patents, patent pending and Trademarks.

Preliminary Drawings
prepared for:
Jason
Leach



CONSPAN®
BRIDGE SYSTEMS

3100 Research Blvd, P.O. Box 20266 Dayton, Ohio 45420-0266
Phone: (603) 526-3999 Fax: 937-254-8365
www.con-span.com

CA

Mendocino County

Ryan Creek

Date: 02/13/07

DYOB No. 115114

Sheet No. **3**

Attachment 5

Conner Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project
Conceptual Design Report

Reference: 506057

Conceptual Design for Improvement of Juvenile and Salmonid Fish Passage in Conner Creek

Conner Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project

Prepared for:

Trinity County Natural Resources Division

60 Glen Road
Weaverville, CA 96093

Prepared by:



Consulting Engineers & Geologists, Inc.

350 Hartnell Ave., Suite B
Redding, CA 96002-1875
530-221-5424

March 2007

QA/QC: QA Initials____

Executive Summary

The Trinity County Natural Resources Division, in cooperation with the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program, has contracted with SHN Consulting Engineers & Geologists, Inc. (SHN) to prepare a conceptual design scoping report for the enhancement of fish passage through two culvert crossings on Conner Creek. Fish passage criteria is based on the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) "Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings" (NMFS, 2001). The calculated fish passage flows for juvenile and adult salmonids for Conner Creek are 1 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 15 cfs, and 3 cfs to 57 cfs, respectively. Replacement or retrofit of the existing crossings is required to pass all life stages of salmonids at all fish migration flows.

Crossing #1 (Conner Creek at Conner Creek Road)

The downstream crossing, at Conner Creek Road, is an existing reinforced concrete box, which impedes migration of adult and juvenile salmonids at all fish passage flows due to high velocities inside the culvert, and an outlet drop greater than 2 ft. Alternatives to improve fish passage include 1) replace with a 19.5 ft x 6.75 ft open bottom arch, and 2) reconfigure bottom of existing box to 2.5 ft lower (at the inlet) at 1:1 side slopes, with a 6% maximum slope. According to the HEC-RAS model, the average velocity inside the culvert at the juvenile and adult high pass flow is 0.5 feet per second (ft/s) and 1.4 ft/s, respectively. The replacement alternative provides capacity to convey the 100-year peak flow with a Headwater to Diameter (Hw/D) equal to one. The new culvert would be 19.5 ft wide compared to an 11.5-ft bankfull channel width, with a 6% maximum slope. Therefore, this alternative complies with the NMFS guidelines for a natural bottom culvert and provides passage for salmonids at migration flows. The cost estimate for replacement is \$131,400. The retrofit alternative provides capacity to convey the 50-year peak flow with an Hw/D equal to one and the 100-year peak flow with a Height of fill to Diameter (Hf/D) equal to one. According to HEC-RAS simulations, the average velocity at the juvenile and adult high passage flows is 2.0 ft/s and 3.5 ft/s, respectively. The average depth at the juvenile and adult low passage flows is 1.0 ft and 1.1 ft, respectively. The cost estimate of retrofit is \$88,400. If constructed, the retrofit alternative will allow fish passage of all life stages at all migration flows through the downstream crossing. This alternative provides conveyance of a 50-year peak flow, and has a slightly lower cost than full culvert replacement. Removing the existing bottom will reduce the observed clogging in the existing baffles, and provide sufficient water depth. Therefore, SHN recommends retrofitting the existing box culvert with a lowered invert and embedding it with rock bottom.

Crossing #2 (Conner Creek at Red Hill Road)

The upstream crossing, at Red Hill Road, is an existing 10-ft diameter corrugated metal pipe, with metal baffles. The existing culvert impedes migration of juvenile salmonids at all passage flows, and adults at 55% of passage flows. Alternatives to improve fish passage include 1) replace with an 18 ft x 8.25 ft open bottom arch, and 2) retrofit with a concrete lining, new metal baffles, outlet jump pools, and a new 5-ft diameter CMP overflow pipe at 5% slope. According to the HEC-RAS model, the replacement alternative provides capacity to convey the 100-year peak flow with an Hw/D equal to one, and complies with the requirements of the NMFS Stream Simulation Method in the NMFS Guidelines (2001) for width, and slope. The cost estimate of replacement is \$206,000. The retrofit alternative with the overflow pipe, provides capacity to convey the 50-year peak flow with an Hw/D equal to one. The road is overtopped by less than 1 ft during the 100-year peak flow.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

The average velocities at the juvenile and adult high passage flows are 4.0 ft/s and 6.2 ft/s, respectively. The average depths at the juvenile and adult low passage flows are 0.6 ft and 1.9 ft, respectively. New baffles would provide resting pools inside the culvert, for juvenile passage, to mitigate higher velocities. The cost estimate of retrofit is \$70,300. Based on cost alone, SHN recommends the retrofit alternative, which includes boulder weir jump pools at the outlet and an overflow pipe to increase high-flow capacity.

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Crossing #1 (Conner Creek at Conner Creek Road)	i
Crossing #2 (Conner Creek at Red Hill Road)	i
Introduction.....	1
Project Description	1
Project Location	1
Background	1
Design Criteria.....	2
Hydrologic Analysis	3
Objective	3
Methods of Analysis	4
The Rational Method	4
The USGS Regional Regression Equations	4
Results	5
Design Peak Flows	5
Design Fish Passage Flows	6
Hydraulic Analysis	6
Objective	6
Methods of Analysis	6
Consideration of Alternatives.....	6
Existing Conditions at the Design Flows	7
Alternatives for Culvert #1 (At Conner Creek Road)	7
Alternative 1-a	8
Alternative 1-b	8
Alternatives for Culvert #2 (At Red Hill Road).....	9
Alternative 2-a	9
Alternative 2-b	9
Recommendations.....	10
Structural Analysis.....	10
Soils	11
Grading and Erosion Control	11
Water Diversion.....	11
Post-Construction Evaluation and Monitoring.....	12
References.....	12

Appendices

- A. Site Photos
- B. Hydrologic Calculations
- C. Fish Passage Flows Worksheet
- D. Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate Worksheet
- E. HEC-RAS Results
- F. FishXing Results

List of Illustrations

Figures

Follows Page

1.	Project Location	1
2.	Replacement Alt 1a Plan and Profile	8
3.	Alternative 1-a Culvert Section A	8
4.	Retrofit Alt 1b Plan and Profile	9
5.	Alternative 1-b Culvert Section B.....	9
6.	Replacement Alt 2a Plan and Profile	9
7.	Alternative 2a Culvert Section C.....	9
8.	Retrofit Alt 2b Plan and Profile	10
9.	Alternative 2b Culvert Section D	10

Tables

Page

1.	Hydraulic Design Method Criteria	3
2.	Conner Creek Watershed Properties	5
3.	Design Peak Flows for Conner Creek.....	5
4.	Design Fish Flows for Conner Creek.....	6
5.	Culvert #1 Alternatives Results.....	8
6.	Culvert #2 Alternatives Results.....	9

Acronyms and Abbreviations

cfs	cubic feet per second
ft	feet
ft/s	feet per second
in/hr	inches per hour
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CMP	Corrugated metal pipe
DFG	California Department of Fish and Game
Hw/D	Headwater to Diameter
Hw/F	Headwater to fill ratio
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
RCB	Reinforced concrete box
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey

Introduction

The Trinity County Natural Resources Division in cooperation with the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program has contracted with SHN Consulting Engineers & Geologists, Inc. (SHN) to prepare a conceptual design scoping report for the enhancement of fish passage through two culvert crossings on Conner Creek, a tributary to the Trinity River.

Project Description

The proposed project involves the retrofit or replacement of two culverts on Conner Creek to allow fish passage and improve access to habitat upstream. The existing downstream culvert, Culvert #1, is located on Conner Creek Road and is a reinforced concrete box (RCB) culvert with an opening 14.3 feet (ft) wide by 5.75 ft high. The existing upstream culvert, Culvert #2, is located on Red Hill Road and is a 10-foot diameter corrugated metal pipe (CMP). These culverts were ranked according to species diversity, extent of barrier, sizing, current condition, and habitat score. They placed 9th and 13th place, respectively, in a County-wide culvert inventory and fish passage evaluation (Taylor et al, 2002). As part of this project, one retrofit and one replacement alternative for each culvert were considered for the improvement of juvenile and adult fish passage. Although the primary objective is to improve fish passage through these two locations, it was also important to verify the retrofit alternatives did not affect the capacity of the existing culvert. In addition, the replacement alternatives must be able to convey the 100-year recurrence interval flows. This report presents the conceptual design for both crossings, along with a hydrologic analysis, hydraulic study, site plan, preliminary construction details, and preliminary construction cost estimate. A final design is not within the scope of this study.

Project Location

The two culverts are located on Conner Creek, northwest of Junction City in Trinity County. Culvert #1 and Culvert #2 are located where Conner Creek is crossed by Conner Creek Road and Red Hill Road, respectively. Conner Creek is the primary watercourse for a 4.9 square-mile watershed which is a tributary to the Trinity River. The project site is shown in Township 33N, Range 11W, Section 2 on the Dedrick 7.5' U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Quadrangle Map (Figure 1).

Background

An inventory and fish passage evaluation of road crossings within the Trinity County road system was provided to the Trinity County Planning Department by Taylor et al. (2002). The inventory identified Conner Creek as a stream reach within the Trinity River basin known to historically and/or currently support runs of coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), and/or steelhead (*O. mykiss irideus*). It also identified the two County-maintained crossings at Conner Creek Road (Culvert #1) and Red Hill Road (Culvert #2) as impediments to fish passage. The inventory estimated the full-pipe capacities of Culvert #1 and Culvert #2 as capable of conveying no larger than 14-year and 19-year return period storm flows, respectively. The recurrence interval flows were determined using the Wannanen and Crippen equations for regional flow estimation.






Photo 1

Conner Creek #1 Looking Downstream

The existing structure at Culvert #1 is a RCB with dimensions 14.3 feet wide by 5.75 feet high as shown in Photo 1. To facilitate fish passage, one foot high baffles are present in the right half of the box. Taylor et al. (2002) state that Culvert #1 fails to meet passage criteria for all species of adult salmonids and all age classes of juveniles due to excessive flow velocities through the culvert along with a drop into the outlet pool in excess of two feet. Additional information on this culvert is provided in the Design Criteria section of this report, including migration flows and other passage criteria along with site photographs (Appendix A).

The existing structure at Culvert #2 is a 10-foot diameter CMP with 6-inch by 2-inch corrugations. To facilitate fish passage, steel ramp baffles are present, as shown in Photo 2. Taylor et al. (2002) state that Culvert #2 meets passage criteria for adult salmonids on approximately 45% of migration flows but fails to meet criteria on the entire range of migration flows for all age classes of juveniles. Additional information on this culvert is provided in the Design Criteria section of this report, including migration flows and other passage criteria along with site photographs (Appendix A).




Photo 2 - Conner Creek #2 Outlet

There are approximately 1.6 miles of good potential fish-bearing habitat upstream of the two crossings. Surveys conducted by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) in August 1974, May 1980, and March 1980 provide the basis for the following description given by Taylor et al. (2002):

"Steelhead were presumed to use the lower 1.5 miles of creek, with suitable spawning areas located primarily in the lower mile. Pools were numerous and formed mostly by boulder and bedrock. USFS steelhead spawning surveys conducted on 3/25/80- no evidence of spawning was observed. Approximately 2,300' above Red Hill Road, the channel steepens to an average slope of nearly 6% until the limit of anadromy at 8-10%."

Design Criteria

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings (September 2001) were used as reference for the design to meet fish passage criteria.

According to the NMFS Guidelines for existing culverts that are being modified or retrofitted to improve fish passage, the Hydraulic Design Method criteria should be used as the goal for design, but not necessarily the required design threshold. These criteria are given in Table 1. The NMFS Guidelines (2001) were consulted for the design criteria for a complete culvert replacement. The following criteria from the Stream Simulation Design Method are applied to analyze the culvert:

1. The culvert width shall be greater than or equal to the bankfull channel width, at a minimum of 6 feet. (The Caltrans Highway Design Manual defines a culvert as a closed conduit with a span of less than 20 feet.)
2. The culvert slope shall approximate the slope of the natural stream channel through the reach in which it is being placed, at a maximum slope of 6%.
3. Footings for open bottom arches should be designed for the largest anticipated scour depth.
4. The replacement culvert should be sized to convey the 100-year flood flow.

In addition to the criteria below, the NMFS Guidelines require that all new culverts be designed to withstand the 100-year peak flow without structural damage to the crossing. If there is a risk of the inlet plugging, the culvert should be designed to pass the 100-year peak flow with a Headwater to Diameter ratio (Hw/D) less than one. The design criteria for capacity of retrofitted culverts is not defined in the NMFS Guidelines, but the Trinity County Natural Resources Division requires that retrofitted culverts for this project be able to convey the 50-year flow.

Table 1 Hydraulic Design Method Criteria	
High Fish Passage Design Flow	Adults- 1% Annual Exceedance Flow (Q1%) Juveniles- 10% Annual Exceedance Flow (Q10%)
Low Fish Passage Design Flow	Adults- Greater of 50% Annual Exceedance Flow (Q50%) or 3 cfs Juveniles- Greater of 95% Annual Exceedance Flow (Q95%) or 1 cfs
Maximum Average Water Velocities	Adults- 6 ft/s for culverts less than 60 feet long, and 5 ft/s for up to 100 feet Juveniles- 1 ft/s or less for any length culvert
Minimum Water Depth	Adults- 12 inches Juveniles- 6 inches
Maximum Outlet Drop	Adults- 12 inches Juveniles- 6 inches
1. Criteria from the NMFS Guidelines for Salmonid passage at Stream Crossings, September 2001 2. cfs = cubic feet per second 3. ft/s = feet per second	

Hydrologic Analysis

Objective

Peak flood flows determined for Conner Creek are used to evaluate the existing culverts, as well as evaluate alternatives for retrofit and replacement. As mentioned in the NMFS Guidelines, new culverts should be designed to pass the peak flow of the 100-year storm, and adult and juvenile fish passage are addressed by criteria at high and low passage design flows. These flows are used in the HEC-RAS model (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, HEC-RAS River Analysis System v3.1.3, May 2005) to assess fish passage criteria and culvert performance. Computations of the Conner Creek flows are discussed below.

Methods of Analysis

There are no stream records for Conner Creek, nor are there streams in the vicinity with sufficient gage data to perform hydrology calculations. Therefore, streamflow values were estimated using: 1) The Rational Method, and 2) The USGS Regional Waananen and Crippen Regression Equations. Appendix B provides the calculation worksheet for each method.

The Rational Method

The rational method is used to estimate peak runoff resulting from various rainfall intensities for a given area. The equation is (Viessman and Lewis, 1996):

$$Q = CiA$$

Where:

Q is the calculated peak flow for a given recurrence interval (cfs)

C is a runoff coefficient (unitless)

i is the rainfall intensity (in/hr)

A is the watershed area (acres)

The rational method is commonly used to size culverts and storm drains. It is applicable and most commonly used for small areas of up to approximately 600 acres. The following assumptions are made to express a complex hydrologic system in a simple model (Lindeburg, 2003): 1) the frequency of the peak runoff event is equal to the frequency of the rain event, 2) the runoff coefficient is constant over the entire watershed area, and 3) rainfall occurs at a constant rate and is spatially uniform over the drainage area.

The USGS Regional Regression Equations

The USGS Regional Regression Equations are used to determine peak flow in ungaged watersheds. The equations for the North Coast California hydrologic region are (USGS, 1993):

$$Q_{100} = 9.23 (A)^{0.87} (P)^{0.97}$$

$$Q_{50} = 8.57 (A)^{0.87} (P)^{0.96} (H)^{-0.08}$$

$$Q_{25} = 7.64 (A)^{0.87} (P)^{0.94} (H)^{-0.17}$$

$$Q_{10} = 6.21 (A)^{0.88} (P)^{0.93} (H)^{-0.27}$$

Where:

Q is the calculated peak flow for a given recurrence interval (cfs)

P is the mean annual precipitation (inches)

H is the altitude index (H), which is the average of altitudes at points along the main channel at 10% and 85% of the distances from the site to the divide (thousand feet)

A is the watershed area (square miles)

These equations are based on a nationwide study conducted by the USGS to determine flood magnitude and frequency in ungaged watersheds (Viessman and Lewis, 1996). The equations are based on correlations of flood flow magnitudes and frequencies with readily available rainfall data and drainage basin characteristics. Use of the USGS Regional Regression Equations is appropriate for drainage areas larger than approximately 100 acres, but the equations are based on

generalizations of vast regions of the state and, therefore, may overestimate or underestimate peak flow depending on the project area characteristics.

Table 2 provides watershed parameters used in the above equations for this study.

Table 2 Conner Creek Watershed Properties	
Property	Value
Watershed Area, A	4.9 square miles 3,146 acres
Runoff Coefficient, C	0.35 for unimproved, forested ¹
Altitude Index, H	1.0 (thousand feet)
Mean Annual Precipitation, P	37 inches
Rainfall Intensity over a duration equal to time of concentration, i	Varies by storm frequency (see Appendix B for values) ²
1. The values for the runoff coefficients utilized were obtained from Lindeburg, <i>Civil Engineering Reference Manual 10th ed.</i> , Appendix 20.A. 2. The values for the rainfall intensity were obtained from the Weaverville IDF Curve given in Appendix B (Department of Water Resources, 1976).	

Results

Design Peak Flows

Table 3 summarizes the results of the peak flow calculations for Conner Creek for this analysis. Appendix B provides the worksheets, including the formulas, calculations, and the watershed variables used for this analysis.

Table 3 Design Peak Flows for Conner Creek			
Design Flow Return Period	Discharge (cfs) by the Rational Method	Discharge (cfs) by Regional Regression Equations	Combined Average Used in Analysis (cfs)
100-year	1,038	1,225	1,131
50-year	944	1,096	1,020
25-year	802	908	855
10-year	661	750	705
1. cfs = cubic feet per second			

Results from the two methods are averaged for use in the HEC-RAS analysis to determine culvert capacity of proposed alternatives for retrofit or replacement. The Rational Method, although regularly used to size culverts and storm drains, commonly overestimates peak flow rates in non-urban watersheds. Although the Regional Regression Equations are appropriate for the Conner Creek watershed and are widely used, an average of the two methods is used to reduce the potential error in applying the generalized regional constants to this small watershed.

Design Fish Passage Flows

The results of the fish passage analysis for Conner Creek at Culvert #1 and Culvert #2 are presented below. Appendix C contains the fish passage flow worksheet created by Ross Taylor and Associates (no date). The results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4 Design Fish Flows for Conner Creek		
Design Flow	Juveniles	Adults
Low Fish Passage Flow	<i>Q95% or 1cfs</i>	<i>Q50% or 3cfs</i>
	1 cfs	3 cfs
High Fish Passage Flow	<i>Q10%</i>	<i>Q1%</i>
	15 cfs	57 cfs
Flows calculated by Ross Taylor and Associates (see Appendix C)		

Hydraulic Analysis

Objective

The objective of this hydraulic analysis is to determine viable alternatives for culvert retrofit or replacement for the primary purpose of increasing upstream migration for juvenile and adult salmonids. By utilizing the results of the hydrologic study for Conner Creek, a hydraulic analysis of the existing crossings and alternatives can be completed. The hydraulic study is used to determine the flow capacity and the fish passage characteristics of the culverts for the proposed alternatives. As directed by the Trinity County Natural Resources Division, replacement culverts shall convey the 100-year peak flow, and retrofit alternatives shall convey the 50-year peak flow.

Methods of Analysis

Two software programs were used to analyze potential alternatives for the replacement or retrofit of Culvert #1 and Culvert #2. An iterative approach was conducted with HEC-RAS for stream flow simulation and with the FishXing program for fish passage evaluation. This approach allows for alternatives to be analyzed according to two sets of criteria: 1) conveyance of the 100- or 50-year peak flows, and 2) the NMFS Guidelines for Salmonid Passage.

Consideration of Alternatives

This report considers one replacement and one retrofit alternative for each crossing. HEC-RAS and FishXing software were used to evaluate compliance with the fish passage criteria from the NMFS Guidelines.

The NMFS Guidelines (2001) state:

"The extent of the needed fish passage improvement work depends on the severity of fisheries impacts, the remaining life of the structure, and the status of salmonid stocks in a particular stream or watershed... The decision to replace or improve a crossing should fully consider actions that will result in the greatest net benefit for fish passage. If a particular

stream crossing causes substantial fish passage problems which hinder the conservation and recovery of salmon in a watershed, complete redesign and replacement is warranted.”

One alternative for retrofitting the existing crossings and one option for replacement of each crossing are considered in this conceptual design. Trinity County, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and Mike Love & Associates were consulted during a site visit (November 21, 2006), along with information provided by Taylor et al. (2002), to determine viable alternatives to evaluate in a HEC-RAS hydraulic analysis. The following sections describe the preferred alternatives for the retrofit and replacement of Culvert #1 and Culvert #2. Preliminary cost estimate worksheets for construction of each alternative are given in Appendix D.

Existing Conditions at the Design Flows

The fish passage flows presented in Table 4 were used to analyze existing conditions at the culverts and to compare existing conditions to allowable fish passage criteria. Currently, Culvert #1 is a barrier to fish passage at all life stages and migration flows. This concrete box culvert exhibits sheet flow and excessive velocities, and the boulder weir at the outlet creates a jump greater than 2 feet; thus, the crossing is impassable for adult and juvenile salmonids. According to peak flows calculated by the USGS Regional Regression Equations, Culvert #1 has capacity to pass up to the 14-year storm with an Hw/D ratio equal to 1.

Culvert #2 is passable for adult salmonids at 45% of the design fish flows, yet for juveniles, the culvert presents a 100% barrier to upstream migration. According to peak flows calculated by the USGS Regional Regression Equations, the existing CMP, at Culvert #2 has capacity to pass up to the 19-year storm with an Hw/D ratio equal to 1.

Alternatives for Culvert #1 (At Conner Creek Road)

A summary of the results of the HEC-RAS modeling of the alternatives for Crossing #1 are given in Table 5. Appendix E provides the detailed analysis output for depth and velocity inside the culvert and culvert capacity at the design flows. The results of the FishXing analysis of this alternative are given in Appendix F.

Table 5 Culvert #1 Alternatives Results			
Design Criteria	Existing	Alternative 1-a Replace w/ 19'x6' Open Bottom Arch	Alternative 1-b Reconfigure Bottom
Average Velocity ¹	6.93 ft/s	Juvenile: 0.54 ft/s Adult: 1.4 ft/s	Juvenile: 2.0 ft/s Adult: 3.5 ft/s
Average Depth ²	0.06 ft	Juvenile: 0.04 ft Adult: 0.48 ft	Juvenile: 1.0 ft Adult: 1.1 ft
Maximum Outlet Drop	2.54 ft	1.0 ft	1.0 ft
Capacity ⁴	14-year ³	100-year	50-year
Cost ⁵	N/A	\$131,400	\$88,400
1. Average Velocity is measured at the juvenile and adult high fish passage design flows 2. Average Depth is measured at the juvenile and adult low fish passage design flows 3. From Ross Taylor and Associates (No Date) 4. Capacity is presented as a recurrence interval at Hw/D=1 5. Cost Estimate given in Appendix D 6. ft/s = feet per second 7. NA = Not Applicable			


Alternative 1-a


One alternative for full culvert replacement is considered for this project. As recommended by Ross Taylor and Associates, full replacement with an open bottom pipe arch is preferred. With consideration given to the above criteria, the design replacement culvert was modeled using HEC-RAS with the criteria given by the Stream Simulation Method (NMFS Guidelines 2001). Full replacement for Culvert #1 would involve constructing a 19.5-foot wide by 6.75-foot high open bottom arch. The arch could be placed at a 6% slope. With an open bottom, this alternative complies with the NMFS guidelines because: 1) it has a span of 19.5 feet which is greater than bankfull channel width (11.5 feet), and 2) the culvert will be placed at a 6% slope, which is the approximately the average slope of the stream channel (2.6% upstream and 10% downstream). This configuration also allows for conveyance of the 100-year flow with an Hw/D ratio equal to one. The cost estimate for replacement is \$131,400. See Figures 2 and 3 for a plan and profile, and section view of this alternative.

Alternative 1-b

As requested by Trinity County, one retrofit option is considered. The retrofit would involve removing the bottom of the existing RCB and reconfiguring it a maximum of 2.5 feet lower, with concrete sides sloping at a 1:1 slope. Figures 4 and 5 show a layout of this alternative. The resulting culvert is a 14-foot by 8.75-foot RCB at an overall culvert slope of 6% with baffles or an embedded natural bottom. As stated above, the existing culvert is not only undersized, but is also a barrier due to an outlet drop and excessive velocities. By removing and lowering the bottom of the concrete box, this alternative provides sufficient increased capacity to convey the 50-year storm, and reduces the outlet drop to allow salmonid migration. The average velocities inside the culvert at the juvenile and adult high fish passage flows are 2.0 and 3.5 ft/s, respectively. The minimum

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects





SECTION A

NO SCALE

water depth inside the culvert at the juvenile and adult low fish passage flows are 1.0 and 1.1 feet, respectively. The cost estimate of retrofit is \$88,400.

Alternatives for Culvert #2 (At Red Hill Road)

A summary of the results of the HEC-RAS modeling of the alternatives for Crossing #2 are given in Table 6. Appendices E and F contain the detailed program output.

Table 6 Culvert #2 Alternatives Results			
Design Criteria	Existing	Alternative 2-a Replace w/ 18'x 8.25' Open Bottom Arch	Alternative 2-b Concrete and Baffle with Overflow and Step Pools
Average Velocity ¹	7.3 ft/s	Juvenile: 7.0 ft/s Adult: 6 ft/s	Juvenile: 4.0 ft/s Adult: 6.2 ft/s
Average Depth ²	0.44 ft	Juvenile: 0.1 ft Adult: 0.1 ft	Juvenile: 0.6 ft Adult: 0.8 ft
Maximum Outlet Drop ³	1.6 ft	1.0 ft	1.0 ft
Capacity ⁴	19-year ³	100-year	50-year
Estimated Cost ⁵	N/A	\$206,000	\$70,300
1. Average velocity is measured at the juvenile and adult high fish passage design flows 2. Average depth is measured at the juvenile and adult low fish passage design flows 3. A negative outlet drop indicates an outlet invert lower than the tailwater control 4. Capacity is presented as a recurrence interval at Hw/D=1 5. Cost Estimate given in Appendix D 6. ft/s = feet per second 7. NA = Not Applicable			


Alternative 2-a


A replacement alternative is considered for the existing CMP at Red Hill Road. As recommended by Taylor et al. (2002), an open bottom pipe arch with an 18-foot span and 8.25 foot height is modeled using HEC-RAS. This alternative allows for conveyance of the 100-year flow with an Hw/D ratio equal to one. The width of the replacement is 18 feet which is greater than the bankfull channel width of 11.5 feet, and the slope is 6% which approximates the average natural channel slope (4% upstream and 8.5% downstream). Therefore, this design complies with the NMFS Stream Simulation Method. The cost estimate of replacement is \$206,000. See Figures 6 and 7 for a plan and profile, and section view of this alternative.

Alternative 2-b

The retrofit alternative considered for the existing CMP is similar to a previously completed project on Deadwood Creek in Trinity County. This alternative consists of installing steel baffles in the existing culvert by placing them in a 6-inch thickness of concrete lining. The outlet drop will be reduced with the construction of five boulder weir step pools downstream of the outlet. The tailwater control of the first pool will be raised 5 feet and subsequent pools will have 1-foot maximum steps. Installing an additional 5-foot diameter overflow pipe compensates for the reduction in capacity resulting from the concrete lining and baffles. The addition of a corrugated

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects





SECTION B

NO SCALE

NOTES

1. CUT BOTTOM SLAB AS NEAR AS PRACTICAL TO SIDE WALLS BUT DO NOT CUT EXST STEEL REINFORCING BARS
2. RETAIN EXST REINFORCING TO SPLICE INTO NEW REINFORCING MATS.
3. LOWER BOTTOM OF BOX CULVERT BY SLOPING AT 1 TO 1 FOR 3'-0" MAXIMUM TOTAL DROP.
4. USE DOUBLE MAT OF STEEL REINFORCING.



Consulting Engineers
& Geologists, Inc.

Conner Creek Culvert #1
Trinity County, California
60 Glen Road, Weaverville, California


March 2007

506057-CBS-1

Alternative 1b
Culvert Section B
SHN 506057

Figure 5

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



Consulting Engineers
& Geologists, Inc.


TRINITY COUNTY
Conner Creek Fish Passage
60 Glen Road, Weaverville, California

March 2007

506057-Hydrology.dwg

CONNER CREEK CULVERT #2
REPLACEMENT ALT. 2a PLAN AND PROFILE
SHN 506057

Figure 6



SECTION C

NO SCALE

metal overflow pipe placed parallel and offset to the existing culvert, and installed at a 5% slope, results in system capacity to convey the 50-year flow. See the Plan and Profile on the next page for details. The cost estimate of retrofit is \$70,300. See Figures 8 and 9 for a plan and profile, and section view of this alternative.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are given in order to facilitate planning of the project. There may be additional requirements not reflected in these recommendations that should be addressed for permitting, final design, and construction of the project. The recommendations below are based on the NMFS Guidelines (2001) and the cost estimate in Appendix D. SHN makes the following recommendations for enhancing fish migration through the two crossings of Conner Creek:

- If constructed, the retrofit Alternative 1-b at Crossing #1 (Conner Creek at Conner Creek Road) will allow fish passage of all life stages at all migration flows through the downstream crossing. This alternative provides conveyance of a 50-year peak flow, and has a lower cost than full culvert replacement. Removing the existing bottom will reduce the observed clogging in the existing baffles, and provide sufficient water depth. Therefore, SHN recommends retrofitting the existing box culvert with a lowered invert and embedding it with natural bottom.
- Based on cost alone, SHN recommends the retrofit Alternative 2-b at Crossing #2 (Conner Creek at Red Hill Road) with boulder weir jump pools at the outlet, and the overflow pipe to increase capacity.

Structural Analysis


The design of Alternative 1-b shall be evaluated by an engineer for structural stability during the removal and reconstruction of the bottom of the concrete box. Temporary shoring will most likely be required for installation of this alternative, which may create various obstacles to work around during demolition of the existing slab and placement of the new bottom.


Retrofit and replacement culverts should be evaluated by an engineer to verify proper design and construction.

We recommend the following:

1. Involve an engineer to evaluate proper shoring techniques for the concrete side walls in Culvert #1 for Alternative 1-b.
2. Limited information is known regarding the type, size, and location of reinforcement in the existing concrete bottom. A particular concern with Alternative 1-b is maintaining the structural integrity of the box culvert during removal and replacement of the bottom slab. Evaluation of attachment methods of the reconfigured bottom to the existing sidewalls may also present some design and construction challenges.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects





SECTION



NO SCALE

Soils

Information regarding soil types, characteristics, and classification is limited in the project vicinity.

We recommend the following:

1. Site-specific soils report to determine if underlying bedrock in the stream channel will prevent grading necessary for rehabilitation of channel slopes upstream of the culvert for retrofit Alternatives 1-b and 2-b.
2. Imported or reused material for graded stream channels, and embedded culverts, should consist of a mixture similar to the adjacent channel of cobbles, coarse gravel and sand material, and should contain no organic material or debris.

Grading and Erosion Control

All reasonable measures should be taken to ensure the construction retrofit or replacement of culverts for this project do not degrade the stream or surrounding areas. Work areas should be restored upon completion of construction. A grading and erosion control plan and dewatering plan, prepared by a qualified individual, should contain recommendations to the contractor for measures to be taken prior to, during, and after construction.

We recommend the following:

1. Disturbance to the stream channel, and associated riparian areas should be minimized and the construction activity should not adversely impact fish migration or spawning. Consultation with NMFS and DFG biologists is required for construction authorization.
2. Excavated material, that is not to be used on the site, should be hauled offsite to an approved storage or disposal area. Stockpiles of fill material stored for reuse or imported fill should be located away from the stream channel and covered. Best Management Practices (BMPs) should be implemented at stockpiles to prevent erosion into waterways.
3. If replacement Alternatives 1-a and 2-a are chosen, a temporary detour bridge will be placed over the channel to provide resident access. BMPs should be utilized to minimize potential sediment and riparian impacts during placement and removal of the bridge.
4. Erodable cut or fill slopes, or other soil surfaces, should be protected by using vegetative cover, jute mesh and straw, rock slope protection, or other measures to provide erosion resistance.
5. Perform site work and vegetation establishment during seasons not subject to frequent repeated or prolonged rainfall.

Water Diversion

It is recommended that stream flow be diverted around all work areas. A cofferdam with a diversion pipe is a common method of dewatering the work area. A dewatering plan should be prepared by a qualified person.

We recommend the following:

1. Authorization from DFG and NMFS is required prior to dewatering. A dewatering plan including BMP sediment and erosion control measures should be prepared and followed throughout construction.
2. Consultation is required with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

Post-Construction Evaluation and Monitoring

Post construction evaluation of proper design/construction and erosion control measures is important to assure the anticipated results for fish passage are accomplished. An evaluation and monitoring plan should be prepared in the design phase of this project.

We recommend the following:

1. Follow the NMFS Guidelines for a post-construction biological assessment of the hydraulic conditions to confirm successful fish passage.
2. Annual inspection during a period of prolonged rainfall to assure the culverts are functioning properly with respect to culvert capacity. Inspection of erosion control measures should be conducted until vegetation is established in disturbed areas.
3. Involve a qualified biologist to perform an evaluation of the fish passage results.

References

Department of Water Resources, Bulletin No. 195 Rainfall Analysis for Drainage Design Vol III. Intensity-Duration-Frequency Curves, October 1976.

Lindeburg, Michael R. (2003). *Civil Engineering Reference Manual for the PE Exam, 10th Edition*. 1376 pp. NR: Professional Publications, Inc.

National Marine Fisheries Service, Guidelines for Salmonid Passage at Stream Crossings, September 2001.

Ross Taylor and Associates (no date), Site Specific Spreadsheets – Fish Passage Flows Worksheet.

Taylor, Ross et al. Final Report: Trinity County Culvert Inventory and Fish Passage Evaluation, August 2002.

U.S. Geological Survey, Nationwide summary of U.S. Geological Survey regional regression equations for estimating magnitude and frequency of floods for ungaged sites, 1993.

Viessman, Warren Jr., Lewis, Gary L. Introduction to Hydrology, 4th Edition 1996.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



Connor Creek
Crossing #1

Inlet view from
above

Looking
downstream



Connor Creek
Crossing #1

Close-up of
inside

Looking
downstream

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



Connor Creek
Crossing #1

Close-up of outlet
drop and pool

Looking Upstream



Connor Creek
Crossing #1

Outlet apron and
pool

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Connor Creek
Crossing #1

Outlet Pool Control
Boulder Weir

Looking
downstream

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



Connor Creek
Crossing #2

CMP with baffles
outlet drop

Looking upstream



Connor Creek
Crossing #2

Outlet with road
deck

Looking upstream

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



Connor Creek
Crossing #2

Upstream
channel

Looking
upstream

Location: CONNOR CREEK, TRINITY COUNTY

Magnitude and Frequency Method								North Coast flood flow Q (cfs) See below for M&F equations			
No.	Crossing	Area (acres) A	Basin max elevation (ft) H	Crossing elevation (ft) P	Area (mi ²) A	Precip (in/yr) P	Elev (ft/1000) H	Q ₁₀₀	Q ₅₀	Q ₂₅	Q ₁₀
1	Conner #1	3146	1480	525	4.916	37	1.0025	1224.7	1096.6	909.3	750.8
2	Conner #2	3146	1480	545	4.916	37	1.0125	1224.7	1095.7	907.7	748.7

Rational Method

$T_c = 60((11.9 \times L^3)/H)^{0.385}$						
	Crossing	Channel length (to top of basin) (mi)	Altitude Index (ft)	Concentration time (min)	Runoff coefficient	Area

Magnitude & Frequency North Coast

$$Q_{100} = 9.23 (A)^{0.87} (P)^{0.97}$$

$$Q_{50} = 8.57 (A)^{0.87} (P)^{0.96} (H)^{-0.08}$$

$$Q_{25} = 7.64 (A)^{0.87} (P)^{0.94} (H)^{-0.17}$$

$$Q_{10} = 6.21 (A)^{0.88} (P)^{0.93} (H)^{-0.27}$$

Template prepared by:

Michael Wopat

California Geological Survey

Redding, CA 96002

June 14, 2001


Modified by:

Allison Kelly

SHN Engineering

February 17, 2007

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



$T_c = 55 \text{ min}$

R1	i	Rational method Q
100-YR	1.1 m/hr	1038
50-YR	1.0 m/hr	944
25-YR	0.85 m/hr	802
10-YR	0.7 m/hr	661

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Hydrologic Region	Stream Name	Road Name	Drainage Area (mi. ²)	Conclusion from Filter Output	Lower Passage Flow (cfs) Q50% or 3 cfs	Upper Passage Flow (cfs) Q1%	%Passable
I	Conner Creek#1	Conner Creek Rd.	4.61	RED	3.0	57.4	0%
I	Conner Creek#2	Red Hill Rd.	4.58	GRAY	3.0	57.1	#REF!

Stream Name	Road Name	Lower Limit barrier<Q (cfs)	Upper Limit barrier>Q (cfs)	Lower Limit barrier<Q (cfs)	Upper Limit barrier>Q (cfs)	Lower Passage Flow (cfs) Q90% or 2 cfs	Upper Passage Flow (cfs) Q5%	% Passable
Conner Creek#1	Conner Creek Rd.	-	-	-	-	2.0	25.0	0%
Conner Creek#2	Red Hill Rd.	0.0	None	12.7	37.0	2.0	24.8	0%

Stream Name	Road Name	Lower Passage Flow (cfs) Q95% or 1 cfs	Upper Passage Flow (cfs) Q10%	% Passable	Comments	Recommendations from Interpreting model output
Conner Creek#1	Conner Creek Rd.	1	15.4	0%	Boulder weir after outlet pool creates a 2 ft+ jump thus making this crossing red. Fish Xing was not used because the site contains baffels.	Full replacement recommended due to conditions below outlet pool. Replace with an open arch or a bridge with a 17 ft width. Could investigate maintaining existing structure possibly with 4-5 jump pool weirs at the outlet.
Conner Creek#2	Red Hill Rd.	1	15.3	0%	Assumed Q1 % = active channel flow in outlet pool. Roughness was assumed n=.04 for ramp baffels, based on roughnesses reported in table 5.1 of the NMFS draft culvert research report. Problem may be increase in channel profile at inlet.	Interim recommendation would be to add a notched beam in culvert outlet to increase depth, reduce velocities and improve leaping conditions. To provide juvenile fish passage, full replacement is recommended with an open arch or bridge with an 18 ft span.

Worksheet created by Ross Taylor and Associates (no date) and provided to SHN by Trinity County Natural Resources Division

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Conner Creek - 506057

Engineer's Estimate

3/13/2007

Item #	Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Extended Price
Crossing #1					
Replacement					
1	Temporary Bridge	1	LS	\$ 20,200.00	\$ 20,200.00
	Clearing	1	LS	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 2,200.00
	Foundation	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
	Bridge	1	LS	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
	Approaches	1	LS	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
2	Demolition	1	LS	\$ 6,300.00	\$ 6,300.00
3	Temporary Diversion	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
4	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
5	Pipe Arch	22.5	LF	\$ 1,763.56	\$ 39,680.00
	Excavation	100	CY	\$ 6.00	\$ 600.00
	Footings	10	CY	\$ 700.00	\$ 7,000.00
	Pipe Arch	22.5	LF	\$ 800.00	\$ 18,000.00
	Headwalls	17	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 13,600.00
	Backfill	120	CY	\$ 4.00	\$ 480.00
6	Grade Channel	1	LS	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 2,200.00
7	Class 2 Aggregate Base	25	Ton	\$ 25.00	\$ 625.00
8	HACP	14	Ton	\$ 125.00	\$ 1,750.00
9	Erosion Control	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
10	Mobilization	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
	subtotal				\$ 84,755.00
	Contingency: 20%				\$ 16,951.00
	Construction Management: 15%				\$ 12,713.25
	Engineering Final Design: 20%				\$ 16,951.00
	Total				\$ 131,370.25
Retrofit					
1	Temporary Bridge	1	LS	\$ 20,200.00	\$ 20,200.00
	Clearing	1	LS	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 2,200.00
	Foundation	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
	Bridge	1	LS	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
	Approaches	1	LS	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
2	Temporary Diversion	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
3	Temporary Shoring	1	LS	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 3,200.00
4	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
5	Demolition	340	SF	\$ 17.00	\$ 5,780.00
6	Excavation	30	CY	\$ 155.00	\$ 4,650.00
7	Structural Concrete	10	CY	\$ 500.00	\$ 5,000.00
8	Natural Bottom	10	CY	\$ 300.00	\$ 3,000.00
9	Grade Channel	1	LS	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 2,200.00
10	Erosion Control	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
11	Mobilization	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
	subtotal				\$ 57,030.00
	Contingency: 20%				\$ 11,406.00
	Construction Management: 15%				\$ 8,554.50
	Engineering Final Design: 20%				\$ 11,406.00
	Total				\$ 88,396.50

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Conner Creek - 506057

Engineer's Estimate

3/13/2007

Item #	Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Price	Extended Price
Crossing #2					
Replacement					
1	Temporary Bridge	1	LS	\$ 23,000.00	\$ 23,000.00
	Clearing	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
	Foundation	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
	Bridge	1	LS	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
	Approaches	1	LS	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 7,000.00
2	Temporary Diversion	1	LS	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
3	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
4	Pipe Arch	66	LF	\$ 1,397.76	\$ 92,252.00
	Excavation	700	CY	\$ 6.00	\$ 4,200.00
	Remove Existing Culvert	66	LF	\$ 22.00	\$ 1,452.00
	Footings	30	CY	\$ 700.00	\$ 21,000.00
	Pipe Arch	66	LF	\$ 700.00	\$ 46,200.00
	Headwalls	22	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 17,600.00
	Backfill	450	CY	\$ 4.00	\$ 1,800.00
6	Class 2 Aggregate Base	50	Ton	\$ 25.00	\$ 1,250.00
7	HACP	27	Ton	\$ 125.00	\$ 3,375.00
8	Erosion Control	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
	subtotal				\$ 132,877.00
	Contingency: 20%				\$ 26,575.40
	Construction Management: 15%				\$ 19,931.55
	Engineering Final Design: 20%				\$ 26,575.40
	Total				\$ 205,959.35
Retrofit					
1	Temporary Diversion	1	LS	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00
2	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
3	Concrete Lining	20	CY	\$ 400.00	\$ 8,000.00
4	Baffles	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
5	Overflow Pipe	61	LF	\$ 197.46	\$ 12,045.00
	Sawcut	40	LF	\$ 3.00	\$ 120.00
	Excavation	250	CY	\$ 6.00	\$ 1,500.00
	Pipe	61	LF	\$ 125.00	\$ 7,625.00
	Backfill	200	CY	\$ 4.00	\$ 800.00
	Base Rock	20	Ton	\$ 25.00	\$ 500.00
	HACP	12	Ton	\$ 125.00	\$ 1,500.00
6	Boulder Weirs	70	Ton	\$ 90.00	\$ 6,300.00
7	Erosion Control	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
	subtotal				\$ 45,345.00
	Contingency: 20%				\$ 9,069.00
	Construction Management: 15%				\$ 6,801.75
	Engineering Final Design: 20%				\$ 9,069.00
	Total				\$ 70,284.75

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Alternative #1-a

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: 50 yr

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1020.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	22.14
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	9.87
Q Barrel (cfs)	1020.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	9.87
E.G. US. (ft)	99.22	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	97.58	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	96.48	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.54
W.S. DS (ft)	96.11	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	1.14
Delta EG (ft)	2.73	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	0.76
Delta WS (ft)	1.46	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	97.81	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	98.73	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	96.65	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	95.32	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	3.04	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	4.34	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not balance the energy equation during the forewater calculations inside of the culvert. The program assumed critical depth at the outlet and continued on.
Warning:	The inlet is submerged and the outlet computations indicate that the culvert would flow full over all or part of its length. The program would normally default to the outlet answer. However, the user has requested that the inlet answer be used.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred at the inlet of (going into) the culvert.

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: 100 yr

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1131.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	22.14
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	10.94
Q Barrel (cfs)	1131.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	10.94
E.G. US. (ft)	98.89	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	97.86	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	96.72	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.35
W.S. DS (ft)	96.30	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	1.44
Delta EG (ft)	2.17	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	0.93
Delta WS (ft)	1.56	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	98.89	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	99.52	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	96.65	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	95.32	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	3.28	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	4.63	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not balance the energy equation during the forewater calculations inside of the culvert. The program assumed critical depth at the outlet and continued on.
Warning:	The inlet is submerged and the outlet computations indicate that the culvert would flow full over

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: adult-Low Pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	3.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	0.24
Q Barrel (cfs)	3.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.08
E.G. US. (ft)	89.83	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	92.77	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	90.54	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.00
W.S. DS (ft)	90.54	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	
Delta EG (ft)	0.71	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	2.22	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	89.83	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	90.54	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	90.54	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	90.54	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.08	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.09	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not balance the energy equation during the forewater calculations inside of the culvert. The program assumed critical depth at the outlet and continued on.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: adult-Upper Pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	57.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	1.76
Q Barrel (cfs)	57.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	1.00
E.G. US. (ft)	90.66	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	93.58	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	91.61	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.01
W.S. DS (ft)	91.60	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.00
Delta EG (ft)	0.95	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	1.98	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	90.66	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	91.65	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	91.58	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	91.60	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.48	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.64	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not balance the energy equation during the forewater calculations inside of the culvert. The program assumed critical depth at the outlet and continued on.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: juven-low pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	0.11
Q Barrel (cfs)	1.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.03
E.G. US. (ft)	89.76	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	92.65	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	90.36	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.00
W.S. DS (ft)	90.36	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	
Delta EG (ft)	0.60	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	2.29	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	89.76	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	90.36	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	90.36	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	90.36	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.04	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.04	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not balance the energy equation during the forewater calculations inside of the culvert. The program assumed critical depth at the outlet and continued on.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: juven-upper pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	15.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	0.75
Q Barrel (cfs)	15.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.33
E.G. US. (ft)	90.09	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	93.05	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	90.93	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.00
W.S. DS (ft)	90.93	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.00
Delta EG (ft)	0.84	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	2.12	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	90.09	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	90.94	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	90.92	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	90.93	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.22	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.26	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not balance the energy equation during the forewater calculations inside of the culvert. The program assumed critical depth at the outlet and continued on.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Alternative 1-b

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: 50 yr

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1020.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	13.19
Q Barrel (cfs)	1020.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	17.05
E.G. US. (ft)	99.44	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	98.84	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	96.48	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.74
W.S. DS (ft)	96.11	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	1.78
Delta EG (ft)	2.96	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	0.43
Delta WS (ft)	2.73	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	99.44	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	100.36	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	96.31	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	93.75	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	4.73	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	6.41	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred at the outlet of (leaving) the culvert.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not converge on a supercritical answer in the downstream cross section. The program used the solution with the least error.
Note:	The flow in the culvert is entirely supercritical.

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: 100 yr

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1114.77	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	13.59
Q Barrel (cfs)	1114.77	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	17.50
E.G. US. (ft)	100.19	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	99.73	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	96.72	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.72
W.S. DS (ft)	96.30	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	2.06
Delta EG (ft)	3.47	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	0.69
Delta WS (ft)	3.42	Q Weir (cfs)	16.23
E.G. IC (ft)	100.19	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	-47.41
E.G. OC (ft)	100.94	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	41.09
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	0.00
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	96.64	Weir Max Depth (ft)	0.31
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	94.02	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	0.16
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	4.94	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	14.09
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	6.74	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	The flow through the culvert is supercritical. However, since there is flow over the road (weir flow), the program cannot determine if the downstream cross section should be subcritical or supercritical. The program used the downstream subcritical answer, even though it may not be valid.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not converge on a supercritical answer in the downstream cross section. The program used the solution with the least error.
Warning:	During the culvert outlet computations, the program could not balance the culvert/weir flow. The reported outlet energy grade answer may not be valid.
Note:	The flow in the culvert is entirely supercritical.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Alternative 1-b

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: adult-Low Pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	3.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	1.89
Q Barrel (cfs)	3.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.22
E.G. US. (ft)	91.26	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	91.19	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	90.54	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.52
W.S. DS (ft)	90.54	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.00
Delta EG (ft)	0.72	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	0.65	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	90.84	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	91.09	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	91.01	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	90.54	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	1.11	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	1.11	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Note:	During the supercritical analysis, the water surface at the inlet was within 0.01 feet of normal depth. Therefore, the outlet will be at normal depth.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred at the inlet of (going into) the culvert.

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: adult-Upper Pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	57.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	5.04
Q Barrel (cfs)	57.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	1.96
E.G. US. (ft)	92.45	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	91.99	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	91.61	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.43
W.S. DS (ft)	91.60	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.05
Delta EG (ft)	0.83	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	0.39	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	91.89	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	92.28	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	91.69	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	91.60	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	1.65	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	1.79	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Note:	During supercritical analysis, the culvert direct step method went to normal depth. The program then assumed normal depth at the outlet.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred at the inlet of (going into) the culvert.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: juven-low pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	1.31
Q Barrel (cfs)	1.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.09
E.G. US. (ft)	91.16	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	91.12	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	90.36	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.62
W.S. DS (ft)	90.36	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.00
Delta EG (ft)	0.80	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	0.76	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	90.75	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	90.99	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	90.95	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	90.36	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	1.06	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	1.05	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred at the inlet of (going into) the culvert.

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #1 RS: 219.27 Culv Group: Culvert #1 Profile: juven-upper pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	15.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	3.23
Q Barrel (cfs)	15.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.77
E.G. US. (ft)	91.64	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	89.90
W.S. US. (ft)	91.45	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	88.57
E.G. DS (ft)	90.93	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.45
W.S. DS (ft)	90.93	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.01
Delta EG (ft)	0.71	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	0.52	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	91.16	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	91.47	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	91.22	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	90.93	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	1.29	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	1.32	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	99.89

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Note:	During supercritical analysis, the culvert direct step method went to normal depth. The program then assumed normal depth at the outlet.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred at the inlet of (going into) the culvert.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Alternative #2-a

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: 50 yr

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1020.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	13.69
Q Barrel (cfs)	1020.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	9.38
E.G. US. (ft)	152.70	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	142.91
W.S. US. (ft)	151.40	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	140.56
E.G. DS (ft)	148.94	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	1.23
W.S. DS (ft)	147.52	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.00
Delta EG (ft)	3.76	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	2.53
Delta WS (ft)	3.88	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)		Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)		Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	147.26	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	147.58	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	4.18	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	4.62	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: 100 yr

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1131.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	13.62
Q Barrel (cfs)	1131.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	10.25
E.G. US. (ft)	152.97	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	142.91
W.S. US. (ft)	151.60	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	140.56
E.G. DS (ft)	149.24	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	1.32
W.S. DS (ft)	147.76	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.15
Delta EG (ft)	3.73	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	2.26
Delta WS (ft)	3.85	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)		Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)		Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	147.83	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	147.76	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	4.53	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	4.92	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: adult-Low Pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	3.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	1.55
Q Barrel (cfs)	3.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.07
E.G. US. (ft)	142.90	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	142.91
W.S. US. (ft)	146.26	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	140.56
E.G. DS (ft)	142.86	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.19
W.S. DS (ft)	142.77	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.00
Delta EG (ft)	0.04	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	3.49	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	142.90	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	143.09	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submrg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	143.02	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	142.86	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.11	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.10	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning: During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: adult-Upper Pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	57.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	13.03
Q Barrel (cfs)	57.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.91
E.G. US. (ft)	148.08	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	142.91
W.S. US. (ft)	147.51	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	140.56
E.G. DS (ft)	144.17	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	1.62
W.S. DS (ft)	143.74	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	
Delta EG (ft)	3.92	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	2.29
Delta WS (ft)	3.77	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)		Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)		Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submrg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	143.15	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	144.15	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.65	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.68	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not balance the energy equation during the forewater calculations inside of the culvert. The program assumed critical depth at the outlet and continued on.
Note:	During supercritical analysis, the culvert direct step method went to normal depth. The program then assumed normal depth at the outlet.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: juven-low pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	1.20
Q Barrel (cfs)	1.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.03
E.G. US. (ft)	142.83	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	142.91
W.S. US. (ft)	146.10	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	140.56
E.G. DS (ft)	142.72	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	0.26

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: juven-low pass (Continued)

W.S. DS (ft)	142.66	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	
Delta EG (ft)	0.11	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	3.44	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	142.83	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	143.00	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	142.96	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	142.72	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.06	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.05	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning: During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.

Plan: Replacement Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: juven-upper pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	15.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	11.69
Q Barrel (cfs)	15.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	0.31
E.G. US. (ft)	146.99	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	142.91
W.S. US. (ft)	146.71	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	140.56
E.G. DS (ft)	143.34	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	1.77
W.S. DS (ft)	143.12	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	0.00
Delta EG (ft)	3.66	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	1.89
Delta WS (ft)	3.60	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)		Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)		Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	142.98	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	143.33	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.29	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.28	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Note: During supercritical analysis, the culvert direct step method went to critical depth. The program then assumed critical depth at the outlet.

Note: During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred inside of the culvert.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: 50 yr

Q Culv Group (cfs)	790.96	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	14.02
Q Barrel (cfs)	790.96	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	14.66
E.G. US. (ft)	157.16	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	145.41
W.S. US. (ft)	157.09	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	143.06
E.G. DS (ft)	149.71	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	2.33
W.S. DS (ft)	149.20	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	3.34
Delta EG (ft)	7.46	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	1.79
Delta WS (ft)	7.89	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	157.16	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	158.12	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	152.32	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	149.70	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	6.64	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	6.91	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	At least one culvert in the culvert group has supercritical flow at the outlet. However, since more than one culvert in the culvert group has flow, the program cannot determine if the downstream cross section should be subcritical or supercritical flow. The program used the downstream subcritical answer, even though it may not be valid.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not converge on a supercritical answer in the downstream cross section. The program used the solution with the least error.
Note:	During supercritical analysis, the culvert direct step method went to normal depth. The program then assumed normal depth at the outlet.
Note:	The flow in the culvert is entirely supercritical.

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: 100 yr

Q Culv Group (cfs)	862.65	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	14.58
Q Barrel (cfs)	862.65	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	14.98
E.G. US. (ft)	157.94	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	145.41
W.S. US. (ft)	157.87	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	143.06
E.G. DS (ft)	149.93	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	2.34
W.S. DS (ft)	149.36	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	3.65
Delta EG (ft)	8.01	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	2.01
Delta WS (ft)	8.51	Q Weir (cfs)	8.17
E.G. IC (ft)	157.94	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	35.10
E.G. OC (ft)	158.89	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	50.00
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	0.00
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	152.62	Weir Max Depth (ft)	0.70
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	150.09	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	0.35
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	7.03	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	5.23
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	7.21	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	The flow through the culvert is supercritical. However, since there is flow over the road (weir flow), the program cannot determine if the downstream cross section should be subcritical or supercritical. The program used the downstream subcritical answer, even though it may not be valid.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not converge on a supercritical answer in the downstream cross section. The program used the solution with the least error.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Alternative 2-b

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: adult-Low Pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	3.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	2.11
Q Barrel (cfs)	3.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	2.64
E.G. US. (ft)	146.08	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	145.41
W.S. US. (ft)	146.26	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	143.06
E.G. DS (ft)	142.86	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	2.36
W.S. DS (ft)	142.77	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	1.04
Delta EG (ft)	3.22	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	3.49	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	146.08	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	146.33	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	146.20	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	143.80	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	0.79	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.74	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
----------	--

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: adult-Upper Pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	57.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	6.14
Q Barrel (cfs)	57.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	6.29
E.G. US. (ft)	148.08	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	145.41
W.S. US. (ft)	147.51	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	143.06
E.G. DS (ft)	144.17	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	2.35
W.S. DS (ft)	143.74	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	1.43
Delta EG (ft)	3.92	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	3.77	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	147.81	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	148.47	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	147.36	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	144.98	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nml Depth (ft)	1.92	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	1.95	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Warning:	During the supercritical analysis, the program could not converge on a supercritical answer in the downstream cross section. The program used the solution with the least error.
Note:	During supercritical analysis, the culvert direct step method went to normal depth. The program then assumed normal depth at the outlet.
Note:	The flow in the culvert is entirely supercritical.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred at the inlet of (going into) the culvert.

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: juven-low pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	1.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	1.42
Q Barrel (cfs)	1.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	1.88
E.G. US. (ft)	145.91	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	145.41

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: juven-low pass (Continued)

W.S. US. (ft)	146.10	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	143.06
E.G. DS (ft)	142.72	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	2.36
W.S. DS (ft)	142.66	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	1.02
Delta EG (ft)	3.19	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	3.44	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	145.91	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	146.12	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	146.06	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	143.68	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nmi Depth (ft)	0.65	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	0.62	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
----------	--

Plan: Retrofit Connor Creek Connor #2 RS: 235.28 Culv Group: Culvert #2 Profile: juven-upper pass

Q Culv Group (cfs)	15.00	Culv Full Len (ft)	
# Barrels	1	Culv Vel US (ft/s)	3.89
Q Barrel (cfs)	15.00	Culv Vel DS (ft/s)	4.23
E.G. US. (ft)	146.99	Culv Inv El Up (ft)	145.41
W.S. US. (ft)	146.71	Culv Inv El Dn (ft)	143.06
E.G. DS (ft)	143.34	Culv Frctn Ls (ft)	2.36
W.S. DS (ft)	143.12	Culv Exit Loss (ft)	1.15
Delta EG (ft)	3.66	Culv Entr Loss (ft)	
Delta WS (ft)	3.60	Q Weir (cfs)	
E.G. IC (ft)	146.67	Weir Sta Lft (ft)	
E.G. OC (ft)	147.05	Weir Sta Rgt (ft)	
Culvert Control	Inlet	Weir Submerg	
Culv WS Inlet (ft)	146.61	Weir Max Depth (ft)	
Culv WS Outlet (ft)	144.21	Weir Avg Depth (ft)	
Culv Nmi Depth (ft)	1.20	Weir Flow Area (sq ft)	
Culv Crt Depth (ft)	1.15	Min El Weir Flow (ft)	157.24

Errors Warnings and Notes

Warning:	During subcritical analysis, the water surface upstream of culvert went to critical depth.
Note:	During the supercritical calculations a hydraulic jump occurred at the inlet of (going into) the culvert.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects





Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



Alternative #1-b

Crossing Installation Data

Culvert Type: 14.3 X 8.75 ft Box
Material: Concrete
Installation: Embedded
Countersunk Depth: 1 ft
Natural Bottom Roughness Coefficient: 0.035
Culvert Length: 22.14 ft
Culvert Slope: 6.01%
Culvert Roughness Coefficient: 0.013
Natural Bottom Roughness Coefficient: 0.035
Inlet Invert Elevation: 89.9 ft
Outlet Invert Elevation: 88.57 ft
Inlet Headloss Coefficient (K_e): 0.5

Design Flows

Low Passage Flow: 1 cfs
High Passage Flow: 15 cfs

Biological Data

Fish Length: 0 cm
 Minimum Water Depth: 0.5 ft
 Prolonged Swimming Speed: 0.8 ft/s
 Prolonged Time to Exhaustion: 30 min
 Prolonged Notes:
 Oncorhynchus kisutch
 Coho salmon
 Length: 4.07 to 18.1 cm
 Temp: 8 to 12 Deg C
 Fish Metrics Calculated

Burst Swimming Speed: 10.8 ft/s
 Burst Time to Exhaustion: 10 s
 Burst Notes:
 Oncorhynchus kisutch
 Coho salmon
 Length: 35.6 to 61 cm
 Temp: 10 to 19 Deg C
 Swim Time: 2.6 - 13 s
 Fish Metrics Calculated

Max Outlet Drop: 1 ft
 Velocity Reduction Factors:
 Inlet: 1.00
 Barrel: 1.00
 Outlet: 1.00

Table 1. Culvert Summary for 1.00 cfs.

Summary for Q = 1.00 cfs	
Normal Depth (ft)	0.05
Critical Depth (ft)	0.05
Headwater Depth (ft)	0.42
HW/D	0.05
Inlet Velocity (ft/s)	0.14
Tailwater Depth (ft)	1.92
Outlet Water Surface Drop...	0.00
Prolonged Swim Time (min)	0.50
Burst Swim Time (s)	0.00
Barrier Code	Depth

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Table 1. Culvert Profiles for 1.00 cfs.

Dist Down Culvert (ft)	Profiles for Q = 1.00 cfs				
	Depth (ft)	Velocity Average (ft/s)	Velocity Occupied (ft/s)	Swim Mode	Barrier Type
0	0.42	0.00	0.00	Prolonged	Depth
3	0.60	0.14	0.14	Prolonged	
4	0.78	0.09	0.08	Prolonged	
5	0.84	0.08	0.08	Prolonged	
6	0.90	0.08	0.07	Prolonged	
7	0.96	0.07	0.07	Prolonged	
8	1.02	0.07	0.06	Prolonged	
9	1.08	0.06	0.06	Prolonged	
10	1.14	0.06	0.06	Prolonged	
11	1.20	0.06	0.05	Prolonged	
12	1.26	0.06	0.05	Prolonged	
13	1.32	0.05	0.05	Prolonged	
14	1.38	0.05	0.05	Prolonged	
15	1.44	0.05	0.04	Prolonged	
16	1.50	0.05	0.04	Prolonged	
17	1.56	0.04	0.04	Prolonged	
18	1.62	0.04	0.04	Prolonged	
19	1.68	0.04	0.04	Prolonged	
20	1.74	0.04	0.04	Prolonged	
21	1.80	0.04	0.03	Prolonged	
22	1.86	0.04	0.03	Prolonged	
	1.92	0.04	0.03		

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Table 2. Culvert Profiles for 15 cfs.

Dist Down Culvert (ft)	Profiles for Q = 15.00 cfs				
	Depth (ft)	Velocity Average (ft/s)	Velocity Occupied (ft/s)	Swim Mode	Barrier Type
0	0.57	0.00	0.00	Burst	Depth
3	0.45	2.83	2.83	Burst	
4	0.76	1.38	1.37	Burst	
5	0.82	1.27	1.27	Burst	
6	0.89	1.18	1.16	Burst	
7	0.95	1.11	1.10	Burst	
8	1.01	1.04	1.03	Burst	
9	1.07	0.98	0.97	Burst	
10	1.13	0.93	0.92	Burst	
11	1.19	0.88	0.87	Burst	
12	1.25	0.84	0.83	Burst	
13	1.32	0.80	0.79	Prolonged	
14	1.38	0.76	0.76	Prolonged	
15	1.44	0.73	0.73	Prolonged	
16	1.50	0.70	0.70	Prolonged	
17	1.56	0.67	0.67	Prolonged	
18	1.62	0.65	0.64	Prolonged	
19	1.68	0.62	0.62	Prolonged	
20	1.74	0.60	0.60	Prolonged	
21	1.80	0.58	0.58	Prolonged	
22	1.86	0.56	0.56	Prolonged	
	1.92	0.55	0.54		

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Table 1. Culvert Profiles for 3.00 cfs.

Dist Down Culvert (ft)	Profiles for Q = 3.00 cfs				
	Depth (ft)	Velocity Average (ft/s)	Velocity Occupied (ft/s)	Swim Mode	Barrier Type
0	0.42	0.00	0.00	Prolonged	Depth
3	0.60	0.43	0.43	Prolonged	Depth
4	0.78	0.27	0.26	Prolonged	Depth
5	0.84	0.25	0.25	Prolonged	Depth
6	0.90	0.23	0.23	Prolonged	Depth
7	0.96	0.22	0.21	Prolonged	Depth
8	1.02	0.21	0.20	Prolonged	
9	1.08	0.19	0.19	Prolonged	
10	1.14	0.18	0.18	Prolonged	
11	1.20	0.18	0.17	Prolonged	
12	1.26	0.17	0.16	Prolonged	
13	1.32	0.16	0.15	Prolonged	
14	1.38	0.15	0.15	Prolonged	
15	1.44	0.15	0.14	Prolonged	
16	1.50	0.14	0.13	Prolonged	
17	1.56	0.13	0.13	Prolonged	
18	1.62	0.13	0.12	Prolonged	
19	1.68	0.12	0.12	Prolonged	
20	1.74	0.12	0.12	Prolonged	
21	1.80	0.12	0.11	Prolonged	
22	1.86	0.11	0.11	Prolonged	
	1.92	0.11	0.10		

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Table 2. Culvert Profiles for 57 cfs.

Dist Down Culvert (ft)	Profiles for Q = 57.00 cfs				
	Depth (ft)	Velocity Average (ft/s)	Velocity Occupied (ft/s)	Swim Mode	Barrier Type
0	1.40	0.00	0.00	Burst	
3	0.61	7.97	7.96	Burst	Depth
4	0.60	6.62	6.61	Burst	Depth
5	0.59	6.71	6.70	Burst	Depth
6	0.59	6.78	6.77	Burst	Depth
7	0.58	6.83	6.82	Burst	Depth
8	0.58	6.87	6.87	Burst	Depth
9	0.58	6.91	6.90	Burst	Depth
10	0.57	6.93	6.93	Burst	Depth
11	1.09	3.65	3.64	Burst	
12	1.17	3.39	3.39	Burst	
13	1.25	3.19	3.18	Burst	
14	1.32	3.01	3.01	Burst	
15	1.39	2.86	2.85	Burst	
16	1.46	2.72	2.72	Burst	
17	1.53	2.60	2.60	Burst	
18	1.60	2.50	2.49	Burst	
19	1.66	2.40	2.39	Burst	
20	1.73	2.31	2.30	Burst	
21	1.79	2.22	2.22	Burst	
22	1.86	2.15	2.14	Burst	
	1.92	2.08	2.07		

Table 2. Culvert Summary for 15 cfs.

Summary for Q = 15.00 cfs	
Normal Depth (ft)	0.25
Critical Depth (ft)	0.32
Headwater Depth (ft)	0.57
HW/D	0.07
Inlet Velocity (ft/s)	2.83
Tailwater Depth (ft)	1.92
Outlet Water Surface Drop...	0.00
Prolonged Swim Time (min)	1.96
Burst Swim Time (s)	1.36
Barrier Code	Depth




Figure 1. Water Surface Profile at 1 cfs




Figure 2. Water Surface Profile at 15 cfs




Figure 3. Culvert Profiles at 1 cfs




Figure 4. Culvert Profiles at 15 cfs

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Table 3. Culvert Rating Table.

Q total (cfs)	Depth Min (ft)	V(occ) Max (ft/s)	Depth TW (ft)	Outlet WS Drop (ft)	Depth Pool (ft)	Barrier Type
0.00	0.59	5.97	1.92	0.00	10.49	NONE
1.00	0.42	0.14	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
1.75	0.42	0.25	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
2.50	0.42	0.36	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
3.25	0.42	0.47	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
4.00	0.42	0.57	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
4.75	0.43	0.68	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
5.50	0.43	0.79	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
6.25	0.43	0.90	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
7.00	0.44	1.01	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
7.75	0.44	1.13	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
8.50	0.45	1.24	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
9.25	0.46	1.35	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
10.00	0.46	1.47	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
10.75	0.47	1.90	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
11.50	0.48	2.05	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
12.25	0.48	2.21	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
13.00	0.47	2.37	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
13.75	0.47	2.53	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
14.50	0.46	2.71	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
15.00	0.45	2.83	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
15.75	0.44	3.04	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
16.50	0.56	2.55	1.92	0.00	10.49	NONE
17.25	0.55	2.69	1.92	0.00	10.49	NONE
18.00	0.54	2.83	1.92	0.00	10.49	NONE
18.75	0.54	2.98	1.92	0.00	10.49	NONE
19.50	0.53	3.14	1.92	0.00	10.49	NONE
20.25	0.52	3.32	1.92	0.00	10.49	NONE
21.00	0.31	5.81	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
21.75	0.32	5.89	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth
22.50	0.32	5.97	1.92	0.00	10.49	Depth




Figure 5. Culvert Rating Curve

Alternative #2-b

Crossing Installation Data

Culvert Type: 10 ft Circular
Material: Annular 6 x 2 inches
Installation: Embedded
Countersunk Depth: 0.5 ft
Natural Bottom Roughness Coefficient: 0.04
Culvert Length: 65.32 ft
Culvert Slope: 3.60%
Culvert Roughness Coefficient: 0.032
Natural Bottom Roughness Coefficient: 0.04
Inlet Invert Elevation: 145.41 ft
Outlet Invert Elevation: 143.06 ft
Inlet Headloss Coefficient (K_e): 0.9

Design Flows

Low Passage Flow: 1 cfs
High Passage Flow: 15 cfs

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Biological Data

Fish Length: 0 cm
Minimum Water Depth: 0.5 ft
Prolonged Swimming Speed: 2.5 ft/s
Prolonged Time to Exhaustion: 30 min
Prolonged Notes:
Oncorhynchus kisutch
Coho salmon
Length: 4.07 to 18.1 cm
Temp: 8 to 12 Deg C
Fish Metrics Calculated

Burst Swimming Speed: 16 ft/s
Burst Time to Exhaustion: 1800 s
Burst Notes:
Oncorhynchus kisutch
Coho salmon
Temp: NR Deg C
Speed Range: 10.99 - 21 ft/s

Max Outlet Drop: 1 ft
Velocity Reduction Factors:
Inlet: 1.00
Barrel: 1.00
Outlet: 1.00

Table 1. Culvert Summary for 1.00 cfs.

Summary for Q = 1.00 cfs	
Normal Depth (ft)	0.13
Critical Depth (ft)	0.12
Headwater Depth (ft)	0.64
HW/D	0.07
Inlet Velocity (ft/s)	0.37
Tailwater Depth (ft)	2.94
Outlet Water Surface Drop...	0.00
Prolonged Swim Time (min)	0.46
Burst Swim Time (s)	0.00
Barrier Code	NONE

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Table 2. Culvert Summary for 15 cfs.


Summary for Q = 15.00 cfs	
Normal Depth (ft)	0.60
Critical Depth (ft)	0.65
Headwater Depth (ft)	1.19
HW/D	0.13
Inlet Velocity (ft/s)	6.45
Tailwater Depth (ft)	2.94
Outlet Water Surface Drop...	0.00
Prolonged Swim Time (min)	0.56
Burst Swim Time (s)	1.82
Barrier Code	NONE

Table 3. Culvert Profiles for 1.00 cfs.

Profiles for Q = 1.00 cfs					
Dist Down Culvert (ft)	Depth (ft)	Velocity Average (ft/s)	Velocity Occupied (ft/s)	Swim Mode	Barrier Type
0	0.64	0.00	0.00	Prolonged	NONE
3	0.67	0.37	0.37	Prolonged	
6	0.78	0.23	0.22	Prolonged	
10	0.92	0.19	0.18	Prolonged	
14	1.07	0.16	0.15	Prolonged	
18	1.21	0.13	0.13	Prolonged	
22	1.36	0.12	0.11	Prolonged	
26	1.50	0.10	0.10	Prolonged	
30	1.64	0.09	0.09	Prolonged	
34	1.79	0.08	0.08	Prolonged	
38	1.93	0.08	0.07	Prolonged	
42	2.08	0.07	0.06	Prolonged	
46	2.22	0.06	0.06	Prolonged	
50	2.36	0.06	0.05	Prolonged	
54	2.51	0.05	0.05	Prolonged	
58	2.65	0.05	0.05	Prolonged	
62	2.80	0.05	0.04	Prolonged	
65	2.94	0.04	0.04		

Table 4. Culvert Profiles for 15 cfs.

Dist Down Culvert (ft)	Profiles for Q = 15.00 cfs				
	Depth (ft)	Velocity Average (ft/s)	Velocity Occupied (ft/s)	Swim Mode	Barrier Type
0	1.19	0.00	0.00	Burst	NONE
3	0.60	6.45	6.44	Burst	
6	0.60	4.68	4.67	Burst	
10	0.60	4.68	4.67	Burst	
14	0.60	4.68	4.67	Burst	
18	0.60	4.68	4.67	Burst	
22	1.34	1.78	1.77	Prolonged	
26	1.49	1.56	1.56	Prolonged	
30	1.63	1.39	1.38	Prolonged	
34	1.78	1.25	1.24	Prolonged	
38	1.93	1.13	1.13	Prolonged	
42	2.07	1.03	1.03	Prolonged	
48	2.22	0.95	0.94	Prolonged	
50	2.36	0.88	0.87	Prolonged	
54	2.51	0.81	0.81	Prolonged	
58	2.65	0.76	0.75	Prolonged	
62	2.80	0.71	0.71	Prolonged	
65	2.94	0.67	0.66		

**Figure 1.** Water Surface Profile at 1 cfs




Figure 2. Water Surface Profile at 15 cfs




Figure 3. Culvert Profiles at 1 cfs

Table 5. Culvert Rating Table.

Q total (cfs)	Depth Min (ft)	V(occ) Max (ft/s)	Depth TW (ft)	Outlet WS Drop (ft)	Depth Pool (ft)	Barrier Type
0.00	0.59	4.90	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
1.00	0.64	0.37	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
1.75	0.64	0.66	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
2.50	0.65	0.94	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
3.25	0.66	1.22	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
4.00	0.28	4.02	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
4.75	0.31	4.28	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
5.50	0.34	4.51	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
6.25	0.36	4.72	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
7.00	0.39	4.92	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
7.75	0.41	5.10	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
8.50	0.43	5.28	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
9.25	0.45	5.44	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
10.00	0.47	5.59	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
10.75	0.49	5.73	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
11.50	0.51	5.87	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
12.25	0.53	6.00	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
13.00	0.55	6.13	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
13.75	0.57	6.25	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
14.50	0.58	6.37	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
15.00	0.60	6.45	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
15.75	0.61	6.56	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
16.50	0.63	6.66	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
17.25	0.64	6.77	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
18.00	0.66	6.87	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
18.75	0.68	6.96	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
19.50	0.69	7.05	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
20.25	0.70	7.13	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
21.00	0.72	7.21	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
21.75	0.73	7.29	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
22.50	0.75	7.37	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Design Flows

Low Passage Flow: 3 cfs

High Passage Flow: 57 cfs

Table 1. Culvert Summary for 3.00 cfs.

Summary for Q = 3.00 cfs	
Normal Depth (ft)	0.24
Critical Depth (ft)	0.24
Headwater Depth (ft)	0.66
HW/D	0.07
Inlet Velocity (ft/s)	1.13
Tailwater Depth (ft)	2.94
Outlet Water Surface Drop...	0.00
Prolonged Swim Time (min)	0.50
Burst Swim Time (s)	0.00
Barrier Code	Depth

Table 2. Culvert Summary for 57 cfs.

Summary for Q = 57.00 cfs	
Normal Depth (ft)	1.25
Critical Depth (ft)	1.45
Headwater Depth (ft)	2.59
HW/D	0.27
Inlet Velocity (ft/s)	9.66
Tailwater Depth (ft)	2.94
Outlet Water Surface Drop...	0.00
Prolonged Swim Time (min)	0.00
Burst Swim Time (s)	6.72
Barrier Code	NONE

Table 3. Culvert Profiles for 3.00 cfs.

Dist Down Culvert (ft)	Profiles for Q = 3.00 cfs				
	Depth (ft)	Velocity Average (ft/s)	Velocity Occupied (ft/s)	Swim Mode	Barrier Type
0	0.66	0.00	0.00	Prolonged	Depth
3	0.67	1.13	1.12	Prolonged	Depth
6	0.78	0.68	0.68	Prolonged	Depth
10	0.92	0.56	0.55	Prolonged	Depth
14	1.07	0.47	0.46	Prolonged	
18	1.21	0.40	0.40	Prolonged	
22	1.36	0.35	0.34	Prolonged	
26	1.50	0.31	0.30	Prolonged	
30	1.64	0.28	0.27	Prolonged	
34	1.79	0.25	0.24	Prolonged	
38	1.93	0.23	0.22	Prolonged	
42	2.08	0.21	0.20	Prolonged	
46	2.22	0.19	0.18	Prolonged	
50	2.36	0.18	0.17	Prolonged	
54	2.51	0.16	0.16	Prolonged	
58	2.65	0.15	0.15	Prolonged	
62	2.80	0.14	0.14	Prolonged	
65	2.94	0.13	0.13		

Table 4. Culvert Profiles for 57 cfs.

Dist Down Culvert (ft)	Profiles for Q = 57.00 cfs				
	Depth (ft)	Velocity Average (ft/s)	Velocity Occupied (ft/s)	Swim Mode	Barrier Type
0	2.59	0.00	0.00	Burst	NONE
3	1.30	9.66	9.66	Burst	
6	1.28	7.16	7.16	Burst	
10	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
14	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
18	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
22	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
26	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
30	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
34	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
38	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
42	1.25	7.35	7.35	Burst	
46	2.16	3.73	3.72	Burst	
50	2.32	3.40	3.40	Burst	
54	2.48	3.13	3.13	Burst	
58	2.64	2.91	2.90	Burst	
62	2.79	2.71	2.71	Burst	
65	2.94	2.54	2.53		




Figure 1. Water Surface Profile at 3 cfs




Figure 2. Water Surface Profile at 57 cfs

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

Table 5. Culvert Rating Table.

Q total (cfs)	Depth Min (ft)	V(occ) Max (ft/s)	Depth TW (ft)	Outlet WS Drop (ft)	Depth Pool (ft)	Barrier Type
0.00	0.59	5.78	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
3.00	0.66	1.13	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
6.00	0.35	4.66	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
9.00	0.45	5.38	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
11.00	0.50	5.78	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
14.00	0.57	6.29	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
17.00	0.64	6.73	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
20.00	0.70	7.10	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
23.00	0.76	7.42	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
26.00	0.81	7.70	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
29.00	0.86	7.96	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
31.00	0.89	8.12	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
34.00	0.94	8.35	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
37.00	0.98	8.55	2.94	0.00	8.70	Depth
40.00	1.03	8.75	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
43.00	1.07	8.93	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
46.00	1.11	9.10	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
48.00	1.14	9.21	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
51.00	1.17	9.37	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
54.00	1.21	9.52	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
57.00	1.25	9.66	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
60.00	1.28	9.80	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
63.00	1.32	9.93	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
66.00	1.35	10.06	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
68.00	1.38	10.15	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
71.00	1.41	10.27	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
74.00	1.44	10.38	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
77.00	1.47	10.50	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
80.00	1.50	10.61	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
83.00	1.53	10.71	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE
85.50	1.56	10.80	2.94	0.00	8.70	NONE


Attachment 6

Little Browns Creek Migration Barrier Removal Project
Plans


TRINITY COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PLANS FOR BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION
AND CHANNEL GRADING
AT LITTLE BROWNS CREEK ON ROUNDY ROAD,
C.R. #232 NEAR WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA

CONTRACT NO. 07-BRIDGE-232
W.O.# 05-2871



VICINITY MAP
TRINITY COUNTY



LOCATION MAP

INDEX TO SHEETS	
1	TITLE SHEET
2	CREEKBED GRADING PLAN
3	THALWAG PROFILE AND DETAILS
4	ROADWAY LAYOUT AND PROFILE
5	DETOUR PLAN
6	GENERAL PLAN
7	FOUNDATION PLAN
8	ABUT DETAILS
9	DECK REINFORCING PLAN
10	SLAB REINFORCING DETAILS
11	THREE BEAM BRIDGE RAIL
12	LOG OF TEST BORINGS

NOTE: THE CONTRACTOR SHALL POSSESS THE CLASS OR CLASSES OF LICENSE
AS SPECIFIED IN THE "NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS" ON PAGE 1 OF THE
SPECIAL PROVISIONS.



CARL A. BONDMINI, DIRECTOR
TRINITY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SHEET	OF	1	11			
TRINITY COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT						
BRIDGE PLAN AT LITTLE BROWNS CREEK						
ON ROUNDY ROAD, COUNTY ROAD NO. 232						

DATE	12/13/2006	1-22-07	1-20"	REVISION DATES:	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT	07-BRIDGE-232	07-BRIDGE-232	05-28/01	1	CONTRACT
------	------------	---------	-------	-----------------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------	---------------	---------------	----------	---	----------

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects







Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




**CREEK THALWAG PROFILE
BRIDGE AND CREEK TOPO**
SCALE: 1" = 20'




**TYPICAL SECTION
CREEK THALWAG UNDER BRIDGE**
SCALE: 1" = 6'




TYPICAL ROUGHENED CHANNEL PROFILE
SCALE: 1" = 6'



**TYPICAL SECTION
CREEK THALWAG**
SCALE: 1" = 6'



**TYPICAL SECTION
ROCK RIBBON**
NOT TO SCALE



CARL A. BOMBINI, DIRECTOR
TRINITY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TRINITY COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT

BRIDGE PLAN AT LITTLE BROWNS CREEK
ON ROUNDY ROAD, COUNTY ROAD NO. 232

PROJECT NO. 05-2871 CONTRACT 07-BRIDGE-232

LITTLE BROWNS CREEK BRIDGE
REVISION DATES


DATE 12/13/2006

SCALE

THALWAG PROFILE
AND DETAILS

SHEET 3 OF 11

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




DETOUR LINE TABLE		
LINE	LENGTH	BEARING
L5	82.11	N41°22'44"W
L6	49.11	N45°59'48"W
L7	19.26	N82°53'46"W
L8	4.62	S64°03'27"W

DETOUR CURVE TABLE			
CURVE	LENGTH	RADIUS	Delta
C3	48.30	75.00	36°53'58"
C4	43.26	75.00	33°02'47"


CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGNS					
SIGN	SIZE	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	MOUNTED ON	LOCATION
C2	4' x 2'-6"	2	ROAD CLOSED	barricade or K-rail	See Plan
C5 (Lt)	4' x 1'-6"	1	DETOUR (ARROW LT)	barricade or K-rail	See Plan
C5 (Rt)	4' x 1'-6"	1	DETOUR (ARROW RT)	barricade or K-rail	See Plan
C23	4' x 4'	1	ROAD WORK AHEAD	4" x 4" WOOD POST	Intersection with HW3

NOTES


- In the event that flowing water is present, a coffer dam shall be built upstream of the project and running water shall be pumped to a location downstream of the project.
- Groundwater during excavation shall be pumped to a location that will allow the water to percolate into the soil before entering the stream. Contractor shall be required to construct a settling basin of sufficient size to contain the groundwater. Pump outflow shall not be allowed to re-enter the live channel.




DETOUR ROAD TYPICAL SECTION
NOT TO SCALE



DETOUR PROFILE
SCALE: 1" = 20'





DETOUR AND CONSTRUCTION AREA SIGN PLAN
SCALE: 1" = 20'



CARL A. BIONDINI, DIRECTOR
TRINITY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects






NOTES

1. MBGR. See "Road Layout and Profile" Sheet.
2. See Hydrologic Summary on "Foundation Plan" Sheet.
3. For General notes see "Slab Reinforcement Details" Sheet.

Legend

- Roadway Centerline
- Existing Culverts to Be Removed
- Existing Shoulder
- Existing Edge of Road
- Approx OG at \square in Elevation View
- Approx OG along Lt Edge of Deck
- Approx OG along Rt Edge of Deck
- H-Pile
- FG at CL



CARL A. BONOMINI, DIRECTOR
TRINITY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects




Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects





Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



BAR SPLICE LENGTH								
Bar Size	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11
All bars, except top bars in spans over 24'	1'-11"	2'-4"	2'-10"	3'-3"	3'-9"	5'-8"	6'-4"	7'-1"
Top bars in spans over 24'	1'-11"	2'-4"	2'-10"	4'-5"	5'-0"	6'-5"	8'-1"	10'-0"

REINFORCEMENT NOTES:

Splices in top main bars to be located near center of span.
 Splices in bottom main bars to be located near bent.
 Spacing of all transverse bars is measured along ϕ roadway.
 Skew 0° to 20° : Place all transverse bars parallel to bent.
 Skew over 20° : Place transverse slab bars perpendicular to ϕ bridge.

GENERAL NOTE

LOAD FACTOR DESIGN

BRIDGE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

(1983 AASHTO with Interims and Revisions by CALTRANS)



DEAD LOAD: Includes 35 psf for future wearing surface.

LIVE LOADING: HS20-44 and alternative and permit design load.

REINFORCED CONCRETE: $f_y = 60,000$ psi

$f'_c = 3,250$ psi

$n = 9$




CARL A. BONOMINI, DIRECTOR
 TRINITY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SHEET		10	OF	11
TRINITY COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT				
BRIDGE PLAN AT LITTLE BROWNS CREEK				
ON ROUNDY ROAD, COUNTY ROAD NO. 232				
PROJECT NO.	05-5871	DATE	07/2007	PROJECT NAME
DESIGNED BY	Randy Cassola	DATE	1/22/07	PROJECT NAME
CHECKED BY	NTS	DATE	2/22/2007	PROJECT NAME
SCALE		DATE		PROJECT NAME
SLAB REINFORCING DETAILS				


Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects

NOTES

1. Rail mounts to block with bolts on approaching traffic side of block and post web.
2. Posts shall be vertical.
3. Anchor bolt nuts shall be wrench tight.
4. Distance from End of Wingwall to □ of first post attached to bridge shall be no less than 9".
5. All rail shall be "Thrie Beam Bridge Rail" except the SRT on the northeast corner of the bridge. The length of the transition section shall be included in the length for payment for "Thrie Beam Bridge Rail"
4. For details not shown see Standard Plans A77A, A77B, A77C, A77D, A77F, A77L, A78A, A78B, A78D AND A78E.




RAIL POST SECTION
SCALE: 1" = 1'




POST DETAIL
SCALE: 1" = 1'




SECTION B-B
SCALE: 1" = 1'



DETAIL "X"
SCALE: 1" = 1'



RAIL POST ON WINGWALL SECTION
SCALE: 1" = 1'



CARL A. BONOMINI, DIRECTOR
TRINITY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION


Attachment 7

North Fork Schooner Gulch Migration Barrier Removal
Project Design Report

Attachment 8

South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Improvement
Project – James L. Hamman Driveway Crossing Plans

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



NOTE: TOPOGRAPHY DEVELOPED BASED ON GROUND SURVEY BY PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC. ON 10/25/06

FOR DESIGN STUDY ONLY

NOTE:
THIS DRAWING REDUCED TO
APPROXIMATELY 1/2 SCALE

PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.
P.O. BOX 828
OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465
(707) 874-0100



DATE: 04/23/07
SCALE: 1"=10'
DESIGNED BY: J. Mann
DRAFTED BY: DR
CHECKED BY: JM

REVISIONS	DATE	BY



PREPARED FOR:
Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study

HAMMON CULVERT REPLACEMENT
EXISTING FEATURES
UPSTREAM OF CALTRANS MP MEN101 52.25

SHEET
1
1

Copyright © 2007 Prunuske Chatham, Inc.

Exhibit 3: Program Report on Previously Funded Projects



FOR DESIGN STUDY ONLY

NOTE:
THIS DRAWING REDUCED TO
APPROXIMATELY 1/2 SCALE

PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.
P.O. BOX 828
OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465
(707) 874-0100



DATE: 04/23/07
SCALE: 1"=10'
DESIGNED BY: J Mann
DRAFTED BY: DR
CHECKED BY: JM

REVISIONS	DATE	BY

PREPARED FOR:
Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study

HAMMON CULVERT REPLACEMENT
PLAN AND PROFILE CONCEPT
UPSTREAM OF CALTRANS MP MEN101 52.25

SHEET
1
1

Attachment 9


North Fork and South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage
Improvement Project Plans

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
01	MEN	101	52.36	1	11

PREPARED FOR:

Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
North Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study

RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY:



PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.
P.O. BOX 828
OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465
(707) 874-0100

PROJECT ENGINEER
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER

DATE _____



PLANS APPROVAL DATE

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.



PROJECT LOCATION

INDEX OF PLANS


SHEET NO.	SHEET ID	DESCRIPTION
1		Title Sheet
2	L-1	Layout, Staging and Construction Phasing
3	P-1	Plan and Profile
4	C-1	Bed Detail and Typical Cross Sections
5	C-2	Cross Sections
6	C-3	Cross Sections
7	C-4	Construction Notes and Estimated Quantities
8	WPC-1	Temporary Water Pollution Control and Dewatering
9	PP-1	Planting Plan
10	PP-2	Planting Details
11	CS-1	Construction Area Signs

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROJECT PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION ON
STATE HIGHWAY 101
IN MENDOCINO COUNTY
NEAR WILLITS AT
NORTH FORK OF RYAN CREEK
AT PM 52.36

TO BE SUPPLEMENTED BY STANDARD PLANS DATED MAY 2006

LOCATION OF CONSTRUCTION

MEN 101 PM 52.36



APPROXIMATE SCALE 1" = 1000'

LOCATION MAP

PRELIMINARY

DATE : May 04, 2007

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL POSSESS THE CLASS (OR CLASSES) OF LICENSES AS SPECIFIED IN THE "NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS".

CONTRACT No.

EA	000000
----	--------

BORDER LAST REVISED 1/22/2007 by PCI

RELATIVE BORDER SCALE
IS IN INCHES





```
USERNAME =>$USER
[PCI file:G:\ACAD Drawings\TCPD Ryan Creek Fish Passage\dwg\NF-PRECONST-TitleSheet.dwg]
```

CU	00000
----	-------

EA	000000
----	--------

DATE PLOTTED => May 04, 2007	TIME PLOTTED => 11:49
LAST REVISION	
00-00-00	



STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Caltrans

REVISOR

DATE


DESIGNED BY

CHECKED BY

SUPERVISING ENGINEER


DIST	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
1	MEN	101	52.25/52.36	3	11



PREPARED FOR:
Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
North Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study

RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY:
**PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.**
P.O. BOX 828
OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465
(707) 874-0100

PROJECT ENGINEER: _____ DATE: _____
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER

PLANS APPROVAL DATE: _____
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.





PRELIMINARY
DATE : May 04, 2007

MP — MILE POST
EL — ELEVATION
MEN — MENDOCINO
STA — STATION
OG — ORIGINAL GRADE

SSPPA — STRUCTURAL STEEL PLATE PIPE ARCH
EP — EDGE OF PAVEMENT
TBD — TO BE DETERMINED
CMP — CORRUGATED METAL PIPE

ABBREVIATIONS


NOTE: PAVEMENT TO BE REPLACED TO ORIGINAL GRADE. PAVEMENT TO BE REPLACED TO CALTRANS STANDARDS BY OTHERS.

NOTE: TOPOGRAPHY DEVELOPED BASED ON GROUND SURVEY BY CALTRANS ON 6/14/06 (CALTRANS EA 47190)

North Fork Ryan Creek Plan and Profile P-1

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
1	MEN	101	52.25/52.36	4	11

PREPARED FOR:
Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
North Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study

RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY:
**PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.**
P.O. BOX 828
OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465
(707) 874-0100






PROJECT ENGINEER
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER



DATE

PLANS APPROVAL DATE

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.


REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
No. _____
Exp. _____
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA





Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
1	MEN	101	52.36	5	11

PREPARED FOR:
Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
North Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study


RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY:
**PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.**
P.O. BOX 828
OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465
(707) 874-0100


PROJECT ENGINEER
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER

DATE

PLANS APPROVAL DATE










THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.



- NOTES:
1. ROCK BANDS IN CULVERT NOT SHOWN. SEE SHEETS P-1 AND C-1.
 2. PLACE ROCK FILL TO GRADE AS SHOWN.
 3. CONSTRUCT LOW FLOW CHANNEL AS SHOWN ON THIS SHEET AND SHEET C-1
- 


PRELIMINARY
DATE : May 04, 2007

North Fork Ryan Creek Cross Sections C-2



NOTES:

1. ROCK BANDS IN CULVERT NOT SHOWN. SEE SHEETS P-1 AND C-1.
2. PLACE ROCK FILL TO GRADE AS SHOWN.
3. CONSTRUCT LOW FLOW CHANNEL AS SHOWN ON THIS SHEET AND SHEET C-1




North Fork Ryan Creek Cross Sections C-3



[illegible]

PREPARED FOR:

Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
North Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study



DATE _____



TREES	COMMON NAME	Key	Plant size size	Protector	Weed mat	# of plants
<i>Acer macrophylla</i>	Big leaf maple	ACE MAC	TP	V	Yes	3
<i>Alnus rhombifolia</i>	White Alder	ALN ROM	15 gal	V	Yes	8
<i>Fraxinus latifolia</i>	Oregon Ash	FRA LAT	1P	V	Yes	3
<i>Sequoia semperviva</i>	Redwood	SEQ SEM	1P	V	Yes	6
TOTAL						20

<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>	Coyote brush	BAC PIL	DP	1 gal	Mulch	14
<i>Corylus americana</i>	Hazelnut	COR AME	TP	V	Yes	13
<i>Heteromeles arbutifolia</i>	Toyon	HET ARB	TP		Yes	12
<i>Rubus ursinus</i>	California blackberry	RUB URS	DP		Mulch	87
<i>Symphoricarpos albus</i>	Snowberry	SYM ALB	DP	V	Mulch	80
<i>Ribes speciosum</i>	Gooseberry	RIB SPE	DP		Yes	28
TOTAL						234

<i>Juncus effusus</i>	Soft rush	JUN EFF	SC		No	54
<i>Juncus patters</i>	Gray rush	JUN PAT	SC		No	28
TOTAL						82

North Fork Ryan Creek
Planting Plan
PP-1

PRELIMINARY
DATE : May 04, 2007

[PCI file:G:\ACAD Drawings\TCPD Ryan Creek Fish Passage\Files Sent\For CD To TCPD 4-30-07\North Fork Ryan Creek\NF-PRECONST-DESIGN-PP.dwg]

EA	000000
----	--------

DIST	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
1	MEN	101	52.36	8	11


PREPARED FOR:

Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program

Trinity County Planning Department

North Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study

RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY:



PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.

P.O. BOX 828

OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465

(707) 874-0100


PROJECT ENGINEER



REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER

DATE

PLANS APPROVAL DATE

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.





DEWATERING

PRELIMINARY
DATE : May 04, 2007

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CD

Caltrans

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SUPERVISING ENGINEER

CHECKED BY

DESIGNED BY

REVISOR

DATE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

1268

1269

1270

1271

1272

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1323

1324

1325

1326

1327

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

1333

1334

1335

1336

1337

1338

1339

1340

1341

1342

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

1354

1355

1356

1357

1358

1359

1360

1361

1362

1363

1364

1365

1366

1367

1368

1369

1370

1371

1372

1373

1374

1375

1376

1377

1378

1379

1380

1381

1382

1383

1384

1385

1386

1387

1388

1389

1390

1391

1392

1393

1394

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

1404

1405

1406

1407

1408

1409

1410

1411

1412

1413

1414

1415

1416

1417

1418

1419

1420

1421

1422

1423

1424

1425

1426

1427

1428

1429

1430

1431

1432

1433

1434

1435

1436

1437

1438

1439

1440

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

1462

1463

1464

1465

1466

1467

1468

1469

1470

1471

1472

1473

1474

1475

1476

1477

1478

1479


1480

1481</

_____ PROJECT ENGINEER REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER	_____ DATE
_____ PLANS APPROVAL DATE	
<i>THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.</i>	


TO BE SUPPLEMENTED BY STANDARD PLANS DATED MAY 2006
EXACT LOCATION TO BE DETERMINED (TBD) BY THE ENGINEER

MEN 101 PM 52.36



PRELIMINARY
DATE : May 04, 2007

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL POSSESS THE CLASS (OR CLASSES) OF
LICENSE AS SPECIFIED IN THE "NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS."



1. The sign messages shown for type of project and fund types are examples only. See the Special Provisions for the applicable type of project and fund type messages to be used.
2. Except as otherwise shown, the legend of sign shall be black on a white background (non-reflective).
3. The border of the signs and details "B-1" shall be blue (non-reflective).
4. The diamond in details "C-1" shall be blue for the background of message, " SLOW FOR THE CONE ZONE", and white background for the orange cones. The color and type of font for the "SLOW FOR THE CONE ZONE" message shall be: "SLOW" white D; "FOR THE" white D; "CONE" orange Arial font; "ZONE" white Arial font.
5. Year of completion of project construction shown on the overlay is an example only. See the Special Provisions.
6. Use when the Project involves Federal Highway Trust Fund.


North Fork Ryan Creek
Construction Area Signs
CS-1

Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
01	MEN	101	52.25	1	7


PREPARED FOR:


Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study

RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY:




PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.
P.O. BOX 828
OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465
(707) 874-0100

<hr/>		
PROJECT ENGINEER	DATE	
<hr/>		
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER		
<hr/>		
PLANS APPROVAL DATE		
<i>THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.</i>		



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROJECT PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION ON
STATE HIGHWAY 101
IN MENDOCINO COUNTY
NEAR WILLITS AT
SOUTH FORK OF RYAN CREEK
AT PM 52.25

TO BE SUPPLEMENTED BY STANDARD PLANS DATED MAY 2006



APPROXIMATE SCALE 1" = 200'

PROJECT LOCATION

LOCATION OF CONSTRUCTION
MEN 101 PM 52.25

INDEX OF PLANS		
SHEET NO.	SHEET ID	DESCRIPTION
		Title Sheet
2	L-1	Layout, Staging and Access Plan
3	P-1	Plan and Profile
4	C-1	Cross Sections
5	C-2	Layout, Concrete Paving & Headwall Details
6	C-3	Baffle Details
7	WPC-1	Temporary Water Pollution Control and Dewatering

PRELIMINARY
DATE : May 04, 2007

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL POSSESS THE CLASS (OR CLASSES) OF
LICENSE AS SPECIFIED IN THE "NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS."

CONTRACT No.		LAST
--------------	--	------

CU 00000	EA 000000
----------	-----------

USERNAME =>\$USER	CU 00000
[PCI file: \\Serge\PCI Central Project Files\ACAD Drawings\TCPD Ryan Creek Fish Passage\dwg\SF-PRECONST-TitleSheet.dwg]	

RELATIVE BORDER SCALE
IS IN INCHES



A horizontal scale bar with markings at 0, 1, 2, and 3 inches. The bar is divided into four equal segments by vertical tick marks.

LAST REVISION	DATE PLOTTED => May 04, 2007
00-00-00	TIME PLOTTED => 13:26

This technical drawing illustrates a culvert project on Highway 101, showing the intersection with San Francisco Ryan Creek. The drawing includes topographic contours, existing infrastructure, and proposed improvements.

Key Features and Labels:

- Topography:** Contours are shown at 5-foot intervals, ranging from 1390 to 1425 feet.
- Highway 101:** The main road crossing the creek via the culvert.
- San Francisco Ryan Creek:** Flows from the bottom left towards the top right.
- Existing Infrastructure:**
 - EXISTING 60" Ø CMP (Cast Metal Pipe)
 - EXISTING CONC. PVMT TO REMAIN (LIMITS APPROXIMATE)
 - EXISTING HEAD WALL PROTECT IN PLACE
 - EXISTING 24" BAY
 - EXISTING 20" ALDER
 - EXISTING 15" ELM
- Proposed Improvements:**
 - NEW 30" Ø CULVERT - 135 LF
 - NEW CORNER BAFFLES IN EXISTING CULVERT 7+00
 - JACK OR BORE NEW CULVERT
 - NEW CONC HEADWALL
 - 1/2-TON ROCK ENERGY DISSIPATOR BELOW OUTFALL TO TOE OF BANK
 - TP6 ELEV. 1390.12
 - ED C-2
 - HW C-2
- Stationing:** The culvert is marked with stationing from 6+50 to 8+50.
- Notes:**
 - CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE NEW CULVERT MATERIAL AND INSTALLATION METHOD.
 - CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT DISTURB HIGHWAY ROADBED DURING CONSTRUCTION.
 - MAXIMUM GRADED SLOPES SHALL BE 2:1.
- Scale and Orientation:** A scale bar indicates 0, 10, 5, and 20 feet. A north arrow is located in the bottom left corner.




Dist	COUNTY	ROUTE	POST MILES TOTAL PROJECT	SHEET No.	TOTAL SHEETS
1	MEN	101	52.25	4	7

PREPARED FOR:

**Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program
Trinity County Planning Department
South Fork Ryan Creek Fish Passage Study**

RECOMMENDATIONS PREPARED BY:




PRUNUSKE CHATHAM, INC.
P.O. BOX 828
OCCIDENTAL, CA 95465
(707) 874-0100




PROJECT ENGINEER
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER

PLANS APPROVAL DATE


DATE



THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN SHEET.




PRELIMINARY
DATE : May 04, 2007



South Fork Ryan Creek Sections and Elevations C-1

NOTES

1. AFTER COMPLETE INSTALLATION IS APPROVED BY ENGINEER, APPLY LOCK-TITE (PERMANENT STRENGTH) TO NUTS PER MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS TO PREVENT LOOSENING.
2. $\frac{3}{8}$ " STEEL PLATE SHALL BE PROVIDED CUT TO ROUGH SHAPE WITH CLEAN EDGES.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL CUT AND SHAPE MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENTS.
4. ALL FABRICATION SHALL BE FIRST-CLASS THROUGHOUT WITH NO SHARP EDGES.
5. ALL WELDS SHALL BE FILLET $\frac{1}{4}$ " WELDS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED AND SHALL BE MADE BY CERTIFIED WELDERS.



DATE PLOTTED => May 04, 2007	LAST REVISION
TIME PLOTTED => 13:44	00-00-00

